THEOLOGY MORAL OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST REVEREND DOCTOR D. ALPHONSE DE LIGUORI. ONCE UPON A TIME THE BISHOPS OF S. AGATHÆ GOTHORUM, AND THE MAJOR SUPERIOR OF THE CONGREGATION. REDEEMPTORIS, ADSCRIPTO BEATORUM FASTIS AD 15 SEPTEMBRIS ANNII MDCCCXVI PER PIONEM VII, ADJUNCTA IN CALCE UNA CUM ILLUSTRISSIMI AC REVERENDISSIMI JOANNIS DOMINICI MANSI ARCHIEPISCOPI LUCENSIS EPITOMATE DOCTRINÆ MORALIS ET CANONICAE EX OPERIBUS BENEDICTI XIV, INSTRUCTIONEM UTILEM PRAXINI CONFESSORUM ADJOINCTAM. CORRECTION OF THE EDITION IN OTHERS.

SIXTH BOOK. Containing the prosecution of the Tractate on Penance and the Tractate on Penances. ANTVERPIE, B PRELO JANSSENS ET VAN MERLEN, IN PLATEA CORIARIORUM, 1829. C 1276.3.3 HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY FROM THE LIBRARY OF JOHN CHIPMAN GRAY GIFT OF ROLAND GRAY SEPTEMBER 4
1934..... #
THEOLOGIA MORALIS.

CHAPITRE. OF THE SACRAMENTARY MINISTER. OF PENANCE. DOUBT I.

Who is the Minister? The confessors lack approval and jurisdiction. Is there an obligation to confess to a layman or cleric in a case of necessity? May a cleric or layman at the point of death, lacking a priest, be able to absolve from censures? However, no priest validly absolves unless he is approved, or the Parochus. • Responsum. The Priest is approved by the Bishop, having regard to secular matters and possessing jurisdiction. » Est certum.

The reason for the first part is taken from John 1. Receive the Spirit of S., whose sins you have forgiven, etc. The reason for the second part is taken from... the possibility to hear Confessions of laypeople unless they either obtain a parochial benefice or are judged fit by the Bishops.... This makes reference to the condemnation inflicted upon anyone under ii cuius, even if not approved by a Prelate, can be confessed; understand how much this is based on the authority of the Council, because Gregory XV decreed that the Confessor of nuns must be approved by the ordinary. The ratio of the third part is taken from the Florentine and Tridentine loco citato, because absolution is an act of justice which requires subordinates. Under this, resolved. 1.

In no case, nor by any dispensation, this sacrament can be validly administered by a person who is not a priest. The Master has said in the fourth distillation, chapter seventeen: If a Confessor be chosen for

supplementation, he may be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election and not extraordinary. In case of necessity, the faithful should confess to a layman: To this adheres: When necessity immines, one who is elected for supplementation may be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years inasmuch as it is odious and strict must be understood concerning ordinary election and not extraordinary. For part from one thing is, namely, to be conteri and to confess to whom one can; who although he cannot complete the Sacrament... yet the defect of the Priest the Supreme Priest supplets. This, however, is to be understood as being not obligatory but rather a matter of counsel, for the purpose either of exciting contrition or as solace, or as advice to be taken, as Wigandt says in tract 13, note 62, chapter 11 number 3. Cross n. 1482 and others passim.

But Tueret autem S. Anton. An angel. Henry. White, Panorm. de, book 2.

Cross n. 1483 et Diana p. 3. tr. 4 R. 133 cum . But this is more probingly denied commonly both laymen and clerics, Concilium page 452 note 10. Lugo distinguished 18, no. 7. Croix loc. c. . item Soto, etc., ap. . Tantùm magis, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. eo casu (ut in Rituali habetur), si excommunicatus decesserit cum signo poenitentiae, poterit ejus cadaver absolvi ab habente facultatem super illa excommunicatione. 54. « 2.

Where Trent is received, otherwise elsewhere, no priest or presumptively regular cleric validly absolves, unless he be approved, or a parish priest to whom both within and without his own diocese does not belong, validly deletes. Cap. II. Dub. II. Of the Minister of this Sacrament is conferred jurisdiction, and the power to be chosen into the Confessional by anyone having the power of choosing, so long as he retains the Parish.

Thus c. 7. . 544 et r. 565) * * ## DUBIUM II. ## What is approbation, and from whom should it be sought? 542 What is approbation? 543 May a simple Priest permit the Confession of venial sins? 544 May the Parochus

appoint a helper from another Diocese? DUBIUM 2. An of the same? Dub. 2. It should be chosen either one who is approved or the Parish priest?

Does an approval suffice without examination and without internal judgment? Is an approval sought and denied sufficient? From which Bishop is the approval to be obtained? The question is resolved from the Bull of Innocent. XII. 549 Whether Religious who have been approved in one Diocese may hear confessions publicly? 550 Another notable point among Busemb. 551 Whether an unjust revocation of approval is invalid? 552 Whether the Bishop may, for just cause, again examine those who are approved, or revoke or restrict their approval? 553 Sancta à Bened. XIV. Regarding the Confession of an accomplice concerning a dishonorable sin? 554 What would come under the name of a dishonorable sin? Whether internal sins? Whether doubtful ones? Whether the absolution of a complicit party is invalid with regard to all sins? Questio 1.

Does he incur a Papal censure who listens to the confession of a complicit party and does not absolve him? Question 2. May a Bishop, or his delegate, by virtue of the faculty from Trent in cap. Liceat, be able to absolve the penitent who has received absolution from one implicated in a vile sin? Resp. 1.

Approbation is the conferring of jurisdiction, 542 but merely the public judgment concerning the fitness of a person to hear Confessions, essentially prerequisite, supposito jure Tridentini ad iurisdictione Lib. 6. VI. Treatise. IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. the thing to be received. Thus. 6. concerning Marriage. » d. 28. and others.

Wherefore it is resolved. » 1. Even though Doctors and Licentiates have this very matter confirmed if any Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election rather than extraordinary; for if any Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. They are promoted, they are considered, according to some, approved by the Pope, as Confessor notes in his words; yet it is more probable, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after

the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, which, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, themselves also may lack probation. * (And this is certain today from the Bull of St. Pius V among the Regulars.) * Although it does not seem fitting that they, or readers in theology, should be examined. * (Now read the Moral.) * 2.

A presumptuous Parish Priest, who has resigned the Parochial benefice, should be approved if he wishes to hear Confessions. The presumed Parochius, who has deserted the parochial benefice, should be approved if he wishes to hear confessions. It is taught by Dionysius that this approbation is not required for hearing venial sins, p. 2, t. 2, misc. res. 44 According to Valero, It seems that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood in this way both for ordinatio and for extraordine. Only such approbation is required for jurisdiction; but any Priest has collatanei from the Church at his ordination for venial sins, as well as mortal ones to which one has been rightly absolved, so that he can absolve them also, according to Bon. d. 5 q. 7 p. 2 n. 8.

Vasq. de Lugo d. 18. sect. 3 d. 21 n. 1 ubi docet ab Ecclesia in Tridente non appro- batum reddi incapacem jurisdictionis tantùm in ordine ad mortalia non priùs confessa. It is queried whether confession of venial sins made to a simple priest is illicit and invalid? If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict when referring to ordinary election but not extraordinary, is today considered illicit according to the Decree of Innocent. XI. concerning Daily Communion (this Decree is extended to be found in Bonac. tom. 1. at the beginning), published in the year 1679, December.

February, so that not only was it forbidden for Bishops to permit a

Confession by a Priest not approved by the Bishop as regards venial sins; but also an interdict was presumed against them. Priest[s], these words, which immediately follow: If any priests shall act otherwise, let them know God, Chapter II. Doubt. II.

Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament, he will be required to give an account. Whether, however, such a confession be invalid? The first common judgment denies this, and those who agree with the common opinion assert it, as stated in article 8, note 6; page 13, note 5. Croix n. 1489.

Lugo d. 18 n. 41. . 26. sect. 5. et . 298 n. 329. cum Auctores discrepant; nam Palud. Hollow. Canis, igitur creditur Christus non subdidisse eorum absolutionem potentiae ecclesie. Others however say that they receive their jurisdiction from the Church, according to c. qu. 3.

R 2. and Lugo loc. cit. with the second opinion, which is held by the Council p. 341 and Platelius together with others in Croix 1., affirms, and I consider this to be sufficiently probable because, assuming that a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is, precisely due to its odiousness and strict interpretation, seen in the case of ordinary election rather than extraordinary; simple Priests do not have jurisdiction from Christ but from the Church, as above, today following Decretum Innocentii it is not presumed that the Church wishes to confer jurisdiction upon them, since they are expressly forbidden to use such jurisdiction. « 4. Parochi non possunt assiccare cooperatores; nisi Parochos vel approbatos ut habent 7 n. 42. contra. See 146, and "Bon. d. 5 q. 7 p. 4 § 1.," Here there is a doubt i.

Whether the parish priest can advocate for a parish from an alien diocese to receive the confessions of his own suffragans? The first opinion affirms this, and such is held by Lugo, on the 2nd day of December, note number 21. . 16. d. ab Alexandro. Seventh number, eleventh article. Wigancl tract. 13 n. 68 R. 12. item Ratio, quia Parochus censetur approbatus pro tota Ecclesia, ut supponunt inferri ex de reform. c. 15. ubi dicitur: Nullum posse Confessiones audire, nec ad id idoneum reputari, nisi aut Parochiale Beneficium obtineat, etc. Hinc colligunt, Parochiale Beneficium poni a Tridentino tertio libro octavo.

However, the second opinion, which I choose to adhere to, denies this, and Barbosa holds this in chapter n. 19. N. SS. P. Bened. XIV. c. when .

The Council, found in Pitton's work on January 1641, declared: The parish priest of a single diocese cannot hear confessions without the license of the Diocesan Bishop. And from another Decree found at Monachell, tom. 4, p. 16 n. 172, on December 3rd, 1707, where it is asked: Whether curates called by parish priests of a foreign diocese can hear confessions in this regard without the license of the bishop? The Sacred Congregation responded: Affirmatively with regard to subjects, negatively with regard to others... Doubt remains number two. Whether a parish priest called away by his own parish priest can hear confessions in that parish without license?

Besides the aforementioned authorities, Bonac. d. 5 q. 7 p. 4 § 1 n. 2-3, and Croix n. 1 5 3 6, when they speak commonly; on the contrary Palaus and Mazzotta 1 1 call it a common tentation. If the seat has set its opinion tenently Berosai Trident. d. sess. 2 3 c. 1 5 n. 1 9, cum Homob. et Piasec. in praxi Episcop. p. 2 cap. 1 n. 1 0. ex alia Declaratione ejusdem S. C. Concilii, quam referunt. 1 1. c c. ubi ad quæsitum: An pronisus de parochitis per concursum censendussit approbatus donec minister ad audiendas Confessiones in illa Diœcesi; in qua liparochialem obnet? S. C. responsit:
CenseriadaudiendasConfessionesdumtaxatineaCivitatevelOppidoubiitisitparochialis

The reason for this distinction is, because (if we have said so), a parochial priest is not approved by the Church universal, but only upon the will of the bishop; whence it follows that, where there are diversities of episcopal wills, the parochial priest is considered as approved only pro tempore for the parish, to which he is relegated; for it is possible for the bishop to make some judgment. Cap. II. Dub. II. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. In regard to one person being suitable for one place, and not for another.

However rightly they say, Bon., loc. cit., n. 12. 37 n. 12. That is admitted 86 n. 13 if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election rather than extraordinary; hence, the opposite opinion may have its place where such a custom exists, which can well confer jurisdiction. However, Wigandt, tract. 13 n. 8o approves the primam opinionem, varying Diacesium according to practice (as he asserts). «5. He who has the power to elect a Confessor, 445 » cannot elect unless it be approved, or the

Parochus.

» 6. For approval, an examination is not necessarily required; provided there be a prudent judgment concerning sufficiency. Con. .)* » 7. The common teaching does not hold that approval sought and denied is sufficient, even though Coninck probably conformed to what was said previously; yet these privileges derogated from in 1628 are noted by Lugo in the treatise on Penitence, d. 21 n. 29 and 51.

Because therefore the opinion is especially after VII. » which said: The annual Confession's precept has been satisfied, who confesses to the Presenting Regular Bishop, but is unjustly rejected by him. The privilege is revoked when unjustly denied jurisdiction, but not when unjustly denied approbation, which today, according to the new decree of Trent, is necessarily required de jure novo; as they correctly say: when approval must be sought from the Bishop, and indeed from his own, namely, the Priest’s; thus Suarez understands it, or rather Vasquez of Penitence intends probabilistically. The reason is because it is an act of jurisdiction, or at least an act of authority, lib. 8.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. any for universal approval.

The second proposition, to which I choose to adhere, denies this, and Barbosa holds it in chapter n. 19. N. SS. P. Bened. XIV. c. when .

Council of Pitton regarding January 1641, where it was said: A parish priest of a single diocese cannot hear confessions without the bishop's permission. Volume 4, page 16, note 172, on December 3, 1707, wherein in response to the inquiry: Whether curates called by parish priests from another diocese can hear confessions in this manner without the bishop's permission? The Sacred Congregation responded: Affirmatively with regard to subjects, negatively with regard to others. Doubt exists number two. May a parish priest, called by another priest of the same diocese, hear confessions in his own parish? Besides AA. cited above, this is affirmed by Bonac. d. 5 q. 7 p. 4 § 1 n. 23, and Croix n. 1536, with a more common opinion; rather Palaus, and Mazzotta call it the common sentiment.

But they hold the opposite opinion, Barbosa at Trent, session 23, chapter 15, note 19, namely, in a different Declaration of the same Sacred College of the Council, as is referred to where the question is asked: Whether one who has been provisionally approved by consignment should be considered an appointed minister to hear confessions in that diocese where

he holds parochial rights? The Sacred Congregation responded: It is to be considered that confession is to be heard only in that City or Municipality where the parish is located, and not throughout the entire Diocese indiscriminately. And the reason for this sentiment is because (as we have said congruously) a parish priest is not approved by the Church for the universal Church, but only by the Bishop according to the Bishop's will; whence unless it be established otherwise from a different will of the Bishop, the parish priest is considered approved only for the parish to which he is chosen; for the Bishop can judge otherwise in Cap. II. Doubt.

II. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 9 who is suitable for one place, and not for another. However rightly they say, Bon. 1. c. n. 12. 37 n. 12. That is admitted, 86 n. 13: if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. The opposite opinion might have place where such custom exists which can properly confer jurisdiction.

However, Wigandt, tractatus 13 n. 80, approves the first opinion, differing from practice (as he asserts) of various Dioceses. « 5. He who has the power to elect a Confessor cannot elect unless approved, or the Parish priest. » 6. For approval, an examination is not necessarily required; provided that there be a prudent judgment concerning sufficiency.

Con. .)* » 7. Approval sought and denied is insufficient for teaching, as commonly it is taught against proposition 24; even though Coninck perhaps reasonably concurs with the aforementioned propositions, yet these privileges derogated in 1628 are noted by Lugo de Pœnit. d. 21 n. 29 et 51. (I thereofe opinion very much after VII.) » She said: The annual Confession's precept has been satisfied, which confesses itself to the present Regular Bishop, but was nonetheless unjustly rejected by him.

The privilege is deprived when unjustly denied jurisdiction, but not if unjustly denied approbation, which today, according to the new law of Trent, is required by necessity as they rightly say: since approbation must be sought from the Bishop, and indeed from his own, namely the Priest’s; thus Suarez understands it, or rather Vasquez of penance intends probably. The reason is because it is an act of jurisdiction, or at least an authority, lib. 10. VI. Treat.

Four. Of the Sacrament of Penance. penance declaration; therefore it ought to be done by the superior. Furthermore » by the name of Bishop are also understood Prelates possessing Episcopal jurisdiction, such as some

Abbots, and a Chapter when the See is vacant; but not Vicars, nor.

Generales Ordinum; (Episcopus confirmatus, etsi nondum consecratus, rectè potest approbare, quia jam habet jurisdictionem. Accordingly, if he is merely elected and not yet confirmed; or who has renounced Episcopal office, because then he lacks jurisdiction. It is asked to what Ordinary the approbation is to be referred? Three are the sentiments.

The first [opinion] teaches that the penitent's approval should be sought from the Ordinary; because it pertains to him to whom he wishes to commit his sheep, and to concede regarding his own jurisdiction. Thus Vasq. according to Busemb., who approves it as probable: and thus many Doctors around caput 1, n. 100 near the end maintain that a Confessor approved by the Bishop of the penitent's diocese can absolve his Confession in another Diocese if he travels there, without the approval of the Ordinariate of the place. This Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1516 calls non-improbable (at least, as he says) either for a Paroch or for a Confessor of magnates, who in respect to them is considered as a Paroch. But as regards the parish priest with respect to his subordinates rightly affirms 1. c. 11 n. 55. and from common law, from the Decree of S.C. referred to n. 544. dub. 1.

As regards the delegation however, they also say from Lugo, dub. 3 seq. n. 2, namely: The second opinion teaches that approval is required from the Ordinarius Sacerdos. Thus . q. 8 art. 3 n. 3. cum et l. n. 1516. Reason, because approval is an act of jurisdiction and cannot be exercised except in a subject. But correctly explained is this Chapter II.

Doubt. II. On the Minister of this Sacrament. With regard to the 11th sentiment [sententiam], they say: it suffices for the Priest to be approved, even though he is external and subject by reason of the residence of the approving Bishop, either in fact or at least habitationally at that time; thus presumptuous and such indeed is the universal practice. The third opinion, which Croix considers more probable, n. 1516, and Carden teaches along with many other authorities from common practice of the faithful, states that approval should be sought from the Ordinary of the place where Confessions are heard.

It is no obstacle to say that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning the non-choice of a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election rather than extraordinary, does not permit such confirmation

under the jurisdiction regarding penitents, except by their own Bishops. For this very reason, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in reference to ordinary election, not to extraordinary; hence, whoever wishes to confess in any place becomes subject to that Ordinary as regards this; or at least this is valid from universal consent, or the concurrence of Bishops by whom it is presumed the jurisdiction over their own flocks has been given to a Priest approved by the Bishop of that place where confession is made. Thus. Questio 90, articulus 3, nota 5. in fine. And hæc illa ultima sententia hodie est omnino tenenda cum Roncag. de edita anno 1700 die 10 Aprilis) relata per extensum apud . 18 de 80.) ubi sic sancium fuit: Confessarii tam saeculares, quàm regulares, quicumque illi sint, in vim ... Bullæ Cruciatae. nulæ latenss confessiones audire valeant sine approbatione ... Episcopi ... loci, in quo ipsi pœnitentes degunt, et Confessariqs eligunt ... Nec ad hoc suffragari approbationem semel, vel pluries ab aliis Ordinariis aliorum locorum et Diæcesium obtentam, etiamsi pœnitentes illorum Ordinariorum, qui Confessarios electos approbdssent, subditi fo- rent.

Then the Pontiff declares that other Confessions shall be invalid, and Confessors suspended; etc., as reprobated both as false and as fictitious; and as contrary to any temerarious opinion whatsoever. And it is evident from the same Bull that the Pontiff spoke ex cathedra, as shown by c. n. 8r. In the Bull of Innocence recently confirmed by Supreme Pontiff Benedict XIV through another Bull which begins: Apos-12 Lib. VI. Tract.

IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. Lolica etc. Mazzotta writes in his treatise on Penance, Disputation 2, question 1, chapter 3, section i, that it is extremely improbable to reject the aforementioned Bulls as the first opinion of Suarez stated above; for he says: "The Bull issued by Innocentius was due to complaints of the Bishops of Portugal. Therefore, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium should be understood as strict and odious regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Also, subordinates without the permission of their superiors chose confessors through other approved Ordinaries, even if those very same other Ordinaries might refuse or revoke their approval." Hence that sentiment has been minimely condemned, if a Confessor be elected for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict to be accepted in ordinary election, not in extraordinary, that when one is elected for supplement, it can well be

confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict to be accepted in ordinary election, not in extraordinary. A secular Confessor approved in some place can absolve subjects of that place who are peregrinating in another Diocese on another day. But I do not assent to this opinion; for first I find the title of that Innocentian Bull thus described (according to Salm, loc. c. n. 88): Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Innocentii Papa XII.

Declaration... with the condemnation of the opinion asserting that such a faculty has place, even though the Confessor had not been approved by the Ordinary of the place in which confessions were heard. Note regarding the place where, etc. Then in the Bull itself it is read, as above, that the Pope has declared no Confessions to be valid which are made without the approval of the Bishop of the place wherein the penitents themselves reside. What more clear? Si autem adhùt cum privilegio Bullæ Cruciatæ requiritur approbatio ab Episcopi Loci, quantò magis sine privilegio?

But contra Roncaglia, cap. 1, qu. 6, they say: that opposite sentiment is not condemned by this Bull, if one has a privilege of a different genus than that of Cruciatæ, for example Jubilaei or similar. But this is obstructed by the Bull of Benedict XIV, which begins "Benedictus Deus," in which it is said: If a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Therefore, the faculty to choose a Confessor in Jubilee years, both secular and regular, shall be given only from those approved by the Ordinary of the place; but the Moniales may choose a Confessor for themselves from the same, provided that it is for Confessions of Monials in that place, although for others [Monasteries]. Religious, even though exempt, should be approved by the Bishop of the place in which they dwell: because to him this act is subject. Chapter II.

Doubt. Second. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 15 And this is certain from the Bull of Innocent X, in which the Pontiff thus decreed: Regulars approved in one Diocese cannot hear confession in other Confessions without the approval of the Bishop of that place. And the same [thing] St. Innocent decreed.

XIII. in Bulla Apostolici ministerii, (confirmata a Benedicto. XIII. per aliam Bullam appo-citam in calce Concilii Romani) ubi dicitur: Declaramus, Sacerdotes tam sanctorum, quae regularis sunt, qui ab Episcopis obtinuerint licensiam audiendi Confessiones limitatam vel quot locum, vel

quot genus personarum, vel quot tempus, non posse Sacramentum Paenitentiae administrare extra tempus, vel locum, vel genus prescriptum, quocumque privilegio praesumpto in vim Bullae Crucis, nullatenus suffragaturo. « 2. The Bishop in his own Diocese cannot approve a foreign Priest to minister therein, unless he is subject to him temporarily. The Bishop in his own Diocese cannot approve a foreign Priest unless he is subject to him for a time.

The bishop can approve per se, or the general vicar, or any others deputed, because it is an act of jurisdiction and not of order. * (V.) n. 588.) * Approval may be given with a restriction to a certain genus of persons, place, time, etc. The bishop sins if to a priest, especially a regular one, he denies proper probation without a sufficient cause. Cardinals de Lugo, d. 21, sect. 3, n. 54.

Approval once absolutely granted does not cease to exist upon the death of the one granting it, but it cannot be revoked without just cause; yet on account of a reason such as a change in morality, judgment, etc., it can be revoked; as others teach and [it is] so. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted for ordinary election, not extraordinary, if made without a reasonable cause, Conin.: * (And they call this sufficiently probable Lugo de Poenit. d. 21 n. 64. with Dicast. : *). The reason, because, as they say, the Bishop does not seem able to take away without just cause the right already acquired by the confessor. Fagund excepts, according to Palum, si the Bishop approves for his own well-pleasure; but Palaus does not allow this, because it must always be understood in terms of just well-pleasure.

At this opinion there is scarcely any probability in practice, because the injustice of the revocation should be more apparent and devoid of all danger of hallucination; but this happens very rarely, since numerous just causes for the bishop's approval of the revocation might exist which would remain unknown to the confessor. Ex justa causa possunt, præsertim a successor Episcopo, ad examen revocari non tantum sæcularis, sed etiam regularis. Some teach nevertheless that mendicants have a privilege, such that they may not be revoked by the same person by whom they were previously approved; but to the contrary Suarez and Lugo teach (d. 2r n. 6t et 62). * (And this judgment must today absolutely be held, according to Cabassut as it is referred.) T. J. lib. r' cap. 10 n. 13.) in the matter of the Bishop of Andegavensis and the Regular Society of Jesus and other Orders, on that same day, January 30, 1659, condemned as rash and erroneous the following proposition: Bishops cannot limit or restrict approvals granted to

Regulars for hearing confessions, nor can they revoke them in any way.

Neither is the Bishop required to give any reason for such revocation, as the statute states that Cabassut refers. T. J. » 1. 1 c. 1 n. 14. To the Most Christian King with Council, statute of the Kingdom on the fourth day of March in the year 1669. And whereas the approval of the Bishop is limited to a place, time, or persons, neither a Confessor, whether secular or regular, may otherwise use that particular Indulgence, even one from the Crucial Bull; this was declared in the Bull of the Apostolic Ministry issued by Clement.

XII. through Spain, and confirmed afterwards by Benedict. XIII » throughout the entire world, as Benedict says. XIV. In Bullae, » Apostolica indulta § 3 in) * Capitulum II.

Dub. II.: Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. 15 » 8. An approbatus ab uno Episcopo possit in aliam Dicecesim recipiendis iudicium sine nova approbatione, contraunt Doctores: ac licet utraque sententia olim videri potuerit probabilis, post tamen decreta Urbani VIII. 1628 apud Lugo d. 21 sect. 2 n. 29 negativa omnino tenenda est. * (Item hoc certum ex Brevi Innocent. X. et ex Bulla Innocent. XII. According to what was said in no. 549.* See Aversam, question 16 section.

8. * (Item advertendum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary. S. Pius V. in Constitutione. Romans, he said, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary; that, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The rules approved by the Bishop « antecessor could be again examined by the Successor, and if found less suitable, they could be disapproved. »

Hence Sylvester, Miranda, Ferraris infer: if a Confessor be chosen for

supplement, he can be confirmed properly through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be confirmed properly through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Vicar Capitular neither can revoke Regulars to examination, nor deprive them of the faculty of hearing confessions, unless a faculty be given by the Bishop, according to our approbation; for then such power expires with the death of the Bishop.) Here two Decreta SS. are to be noted lastly. Of our Pontiff Benedictus XIV the 553rd. Sacramentum, et muneri apostolicensi, positum in fine libri numerorum.

I and II in which it has been declared that the Confessional is entirely deprived of jurisdiction to absolve a culpable turpitude against the Sixth Commandment's Precept, as well as from incurring Papal Excommunication by accepting such culpable confession: Nevertheless, a case of extreme necessity is admitted, specifically one of the article of death, within which it is permitted to absolve the accomplice, provided that no presumptuous simple Priest be lacking who could impart the absolution; except if another Priest cannot be called or reach without grave infamy or scandal; yet he is bound. Confessarius complex talia pericula infamiae, aut scandali avertere, si potest, sub eadem piena excommunicationis, licet tunc valide absolveret, si non averteret. About such a Decree take heed I: if any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious and strict it must be understood concerning ordinary, not extraordinary election, namely for the name of sin 554 tarpis all grave external sin against the Sixth Commandment comes, although it has only been touched, or conversation, yet I most certainly believe with many learned men whom I have consulted on this judgment that it is unjustly blamed by others in Lib. 16. VI.

Tract. IV. Regarding the Sacrament of Penance. doubt dismissed. And the same [people] feel [about it]. 2.

Because penalties imposed by law are properly and naturally interpreted in their own sense, and according to the natural sense the words of the Bull state: In a disgraceful and dishonorable sin against sexuality, all such turpitudinous sins without doubt are comprehended. 3. Because the end of this law is indeed to remove occasions, not merely those of copulation, but

all turpitude from the tribunal of Penance's sanctity. On the contrary, venial sins of inhonestity are not comprehended, whether they be from the smallness of matter, or from defect of attention, or consent; because venials are not of such obligation as to be manifestly confessed, so it is said n. 277. They rightly say in note 278 regarding presumed mortal sins, whether they are internally indicated imperfectly or not fully externally: therefore the sin will not be reserved, even though it may have been internally grave, if the presumption is not externally grave, as they state in note 279.

They add in note 280 from Suarez, Dicastery and Anaconda that doubtful mortal sins, whether from doubt of fact or doubt of law, are not reserved, because it does not seem that Superiors wish to reserve doubts unless they have expressly declared so; and this is according to the common judgment which we will present below in note 600. vers. Quaer. I. They hold that if there is a doubt as to whether he who has sinned gravely has confessed mortally, it is permissible for the confessor to have done so even though the mortal sin was not formally involved in the sin of another person, as they had previously stated in no. 241. They observe: if a confessor is chosen by way of supplement, his confirmation could well be established through an additional three years following the period of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, given its odious and strict interpretation from the perspective of ordinary election rather than extraordinary, should not render the absolution provided by a complicit confessor ineffective. In my opinion, this would constitute presumptuousness on matters pertaining to mortal sins, which are complex, and who has not yet been absolved from another detestable sin, himself confesses.

I infer this from the words of the same Bull, in which it is said: And therefore no absolution at all and utterly irremissible should be given. But I hold otherwise, namely, if that very same person has already been absolved from a corrupt sin, because then the disposition to receive is seen as having ceased, on account of which the jurisdiction of the Pontiff is considered as having been taken away from the Confessor, they add in Chapter II. Doubt. II.

Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament. 17 pend. cit. n. 277, the same must be said about a mortal sin committed and rightly confessed before the administration of Penance, because the law does not look back, as taught by P. Suaren. Before the fit occurs, 1. whether incurring this excommunication by a minister of this sacrament causes a priest, who does not absolve anyone involved but has merely listened to the confession, to incur such an excommunication? Upon this doubt, according to St.

Alphonsus regarding the Sacrament of Penance, which responded on July 9, 1751, absolutely: "Not to have gone to confession for the aforementioned excommunication for the completion of absolution." Ethiopicus ego jam dudum adhaesi; sed postea, cum percurrissem Constitutionem ejusdem Pontificis Benedicti.

XIV. Beyond the aforementioned, repeatedly cited § 59, the opposite, i.e., a declaration to the contrary, is found, as appears from the following verses: Non lessis sacerdoti complices quiviscumque extra articulum mortis Confessionem excludit paenitentem, eumque absolvit vel qui in articulo mortis absolvit cum abs te sacerdos non desit... excommunicationis maje rium poena nobis imposita a Constitutionibus incitat. It is asked whether by reason of the concession of Trent the Bishop is incapacitated. It is permitted. Session 6, Chapter 2, Article 4, whether one implicated in a turpitudinal sin can receive absolution from the penitent?

It seems to be an obstacle; for if either the Bishop or his substitute delegate could absolve in such a case when it is hidden, the pontifical reservation would become both useless and superfluous, since in this case no concealment can occur except by chance: yet some later judgment (as indeed was the case with Fagnan) shows incapacity. Some Rescript, n. 4, t. i. p. 17, 1 cum oligtra d) non potest habere effectum, nisid rogetur privilegio a beodem Superiore prius concess o, per ipsam necessarii intellectu debe facta generalis privilégie derogatio, ne lex frustratori reddatur. The same is held by Dionysius in book 7, treatise 2, resolution 2, chapter 1, with allowance being made for this, namely: That which is thus sealed (or locked) generally cannot be violated, unless in a particular case; otherwise the Council would have it that this generic derogation should be reputed as specific, and if there were no moment. Yet it seems probable that there can be retained what has been conceded to the bishops by right of the Council without derogation from the necessary intellectual precept, so that general privilege might not be derogated for a specific case, otherwise no moment would be.

VI. Treatise. IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance. - He sells this case when it is hidden, for the reservation of the Penitentiary would not entirely be rendered useless and absurd, because although this hidden case is ordinarily here, it may sometimes happen if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation that he can be adequately confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be understood regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be public: because the law of reservation would at least have place in Rome and in all other places where Tridentine has not

been received - and where even the Bishops do not possess the said faculty; as commonly they teach. VI. sect. 2 n. 6. 2 c. 11 n. 2 - 1 tract. 4 d. 4 p. 3 - 5: 1 n. 2 cum; because the Council's faculties are mediately conceded to them: it is not proper that those who repel burdens should enjoy privileges. And they also feel in this respect: Bulla Cruciatae cap. 6 p. 171 n. 300.

Here many Authorities quote in support of this opinion, who recently wrote on the Constitution of the Sacrament, as mentioned above. ## DUBIUM III. What, and what kind of jurisdiction does the Confessor have, and whence does he derive it? - 557. What is jurisdiction, and who has ordinary jurisdiction? - 558. Does the Vicar General have it when contradicted by the Bishop? - 559.

Does a delegation lapse with the death of the delegator? Whether heretics and those excommunicated for avoidance validly absolve in the article of death? - 561. Can all priests absolve both at the point of death and in danger of death? And what is reckoned to be this kind of danger? - 562.

Can a simple priest absolve when the approver is present? - 563. In which cases can he licitly absolve? Dub. In quibus casibus possit licite absolvere? Dub.

An any confessor can absolve a dying person from reserved sins even if the superior is present? Doubt. II. In death, to absolve from reserved sins by the Pope, must the bishop be approached?

Doubt. III. Whether the moribund is bound to petition for - absolution from the Superior, at least by letter, or now - when? Chap. II.

Dub. III. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 19 564 Whether a tolerated excommunicate can absolve from venial sins? May Regulars absolve without the approval of Bishops?

And whether all priests approved by the Bishop can absolve. To hear confessions without the permission of the Parochial Priest? How and in what manner can one choose a Confessor for oneself? Dub. 1. How the Bishops, and other Prelates?

Dub; a. How Cardinals? And as for parish priests? When dost thou possess delegated power so that thou mayst subdelegate it? And what about the delegate regarding the universality of causes? After death, is one bound by reserved cases even if he subsequently presents himself to a Superior? See

other matters? By whom can scholars, soldiers, pilgrims, etc., be absolved? Soldiers serving in garrisons cannot absolve chaplains accompanying armies. Is it sufficient that there be presumed permission to receive Confessions? When is it permissible to absolve with doubtful or probable jurisdiction?

I. Does a common error deprive one of jurisdiction? 573 Qu. II. Is it permitted to administer the Sacrament with jurisdiction alone being probable? 564 Is there an obligation to confess to the Parochial Priest? 575 Can itinerant Regulars confess to any priest? 576 Can nuns seeking extraordinary confession and not obtaining it confess to anyone? 577 Many notes about confessions of nuns, in whom, in the internal forum, receives a distinct power from the power of the Order; for this is given through the Sacrament of Orders, and belongs to every priest. The other [power] however is through external concession of the Church, and not to all priests, and can be taken away by them, and without it, absolution would be invalid. For there are two: ordinary; and delegated.

Ordinaria est, quam habent ii, qui ex vi proprio officii curam animarum habent, ut Papa, Episcopus, Parochus (huc revocantur Archiepiscopi erga subditos suorum Episcoporum, tunc tantum, quando 50 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. • in act of visiting), archipresbyters, archdeacons, prelates of religions, perpetual vicar of the bishop, or presumed parish priest. It is asked whether the Vicar General of the Bishop has ordinary jurisdiction presumptively in the sacramental forum, so that he may hear confessions and grant the power to hear confessions to others? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by Soto, in I, question 11, note 42. They say that the Vicar has ordinary jurisdiction in civil matters alone, but spiritual jurisdiction he receives from the Bishop by delegation.

This they prove, I [i.e., from this], namely, that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of an ordinary election, but not of an extraordinary one, should thus be understood; moreover, the jurisdiction of the Vicar ceases with the death of the Bishop. They also approve from the Second opinion, which is more common and truer, affirming that, and they hold it, Chapter Three, Section Forty-three. Sylv. v. Confession interrogatio primae.

From the Saying. Bossuet. et lib. 3 d. 29 n. 15 cum Hostilium ut habetur ex c. 2 de Et confirmatur ex 24 c. 6 de Refut.: ubi cum voluit Concilium excommunicare Vicarium a facultate absolvendi ab heresi id expressit dicens: Eis tantum (id est Episcopis) non summo Vicariis sit permisum. Therefore it supposes the Tridentine faculties of bishops; unless expressly restricted by law, they are understood to be communicated presumptively to vicars. Now as to the first objection, it is answered that if a penitentiary be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously interpreted in ordinary elections, not in extraordinary ones; indeed, when the Bishop dies the jurisdiction of the Vicar ceases, not because his jurisdiction was not ordinary, but because, by the deficiency of the Bishop himself, he no longer remains Vicar.

To the second point, it is replied that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Whereupon the presumed Vicar under the name of the Bishop constitutes one tribunal with the Bishop... Delegated jurisdiction is said to be that which legitimately is given according to Cap. II. Dub. III. Of the Minister of this Sacrament, he who has ordinary power, whether silently or explicitly; so that from the Pope for all the Church, from the Bishop for his Diocese, from the Parochial Priest for the Parish; observing this distinction, if anyone is chosen as Confessor by way of supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if anyone is chosen as Confessor by way of supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary.

The Pope may give against unwilling Bishops and Parishes, not contrary to. And although the exterior jurisdiction expires by the death of the delegator, nevertheless this interior jurisdiction does not; unless the successor revokes it, as teaches Sanchez, Suarez, and Navar. Concil. contra 1. 5 c. 10 n. 22. "Does the delegation expire upon the death of the delegator?"

Distinguish the general delegation from the particular one. A general delegation to the Pope is commonly held and practiced by consensus; if someone were chosen as Confessor for supplementation, it could well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be accepted concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, should not be extinguished by his death, according to canon 9 of Off. Delegation in Italy unless a grant has been made in this manner: Up to our pleased pleasure: or according to any will of ours, and similarly; other people feel that general delegation from a Bishop is; if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary; that is, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary; such prohibition does not cease with his death if confession has not yet been made, until Vasq. is revoked by the successor, or the prefixed time expires; thus more commonly and probablier 1. 8 d. 28 n. 72. Patent tractatus tertius de disciplina pontificia paginis 1684 nota tres.

Conc. pag. 545 n. 26. et . c. 11 n. 86. cum Conc. firmatur ex praxi, et regula generali, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. gratia facte non ex- pirent finita jurisdictione concedentis. Si vero delegatio fuit in particulari, scel. de audienda alicujus tantùm Confessione, rectè cum « Porrò hujusmodi potestatam delegatam absolven » di quemcumque à quibuscumque peccatis, in articulo seu periculo mortis (hæc enim pro eodem sumuntur in jure, ut vid. 4 res. 57 et et 72) habet ex jure communi quivis Sacerdos praesumptus excommunicatus et degradatus, si alius desit. "(as presumptively stated in 2 cap. 13 n. 5. with Zambr. and others." But see to be stated shortly thereafter): *. Lib: VI.

Seek. I. The bearers of heresy, schismatics, and those expelled from the communion of the Church are they who are to be refused absolution on their deathbed if another is absent? The first opinion affirms this, and it is held by 2 c. 13 n. 5. And with Lugo, Soto, Sess. 14 c. 7 where it is said: In the Church of God, it has always been guarded that there be no reservation in the article of death; and hence all priests can absolve any penitent from whatever sins and censures they may have.

The second opinion however rejects it with trepidation, and this view is held in S. 7 ad 2, where speaking about the aforementioned withdrawals from communion of the Church, it says: They can lawfully baptize in case of necessity, yet in no circumstance can they lawfully consecrate the Eucharist or administer other Sacraments. It does not prevent that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary. The holy Doctor says: "In no way can they licitly do this, but rather invalidly; for illicitly in our case it is the same as invalidly; for if one were first excommunicated from the part of a confessor, without having jurisdiction or certainly hindered by censure (always and through itself to be avoided, though if tolerated), he would have to administer validly the sacraments at the point of death, especially the Sacrament of Penance, according to divine and natural precept, which could not be obstructed by a human precept of the Church." They say the same thing throughout.

Petri Cornis. T. 4, p. 158, q. 8. Auctor apud Croix de Offic. Confession. I. I c. 1. v. I say this: (whoever calls this more probable, even though he believes that its contrary is not improbable), and others in greater number as follows, who wrote scrupulously before the Council, at which time himself Navarrus openly confessed our opinion to have been common. Reason why (as we said in n. 562, v.

That is clearer). The Council in the cited chapter 7 scarcely speaks about simple priests, but about those lacking jurisdiction in reserved cases, whom it did not declare to lack the article of death; this is because Tridentine (as we have shown in the aforementioned) did not establish a new right there, but only approved the ancient law of the Church: before the Council, however, as Fagnanus and itself Câp demonstrate. H. Dub. III.

Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. n. 2. where it is thus stated: « (It was sought by the Bishop of Valence whether a penitent on the verge of death might be absolved by any priest from reserved cases, although excommunicated and denounced? » The General Congregation deemed it impossible because that opinion seems common: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, his confirmation can be appropriately made through another triennium after the time of the supplement; since the prohibition on choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, like the prohibition on ordinary choice, odious and strict in interpretation, not extraordinary. Thus, such excommunicated individuals cannot presumptively absolve in this case of necessity; so be it said accordingly by the Magistrates. S. Thom. Rich: S. Auston.

Scotus, Durand. Sylvest. and Soto. Nec obstat cap. 7 de Casuum reservatione, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. debet intel- ligi de omnibus Sacerdotibus in uni: tate Ecclesiæ viventibus: referen- dumque (nota) ad eos Sacerdotes, de quibus eod. c. 7 in prima et secunda parte agitur, qui habent vel ordinariam vel delegatam potestatem. Hucusque verba Declarationis. And Fagnanus says: if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary, that is, which, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary.

DD. post Concilium ideò oppo- sitam sententiam tenuerint, quia ignorarunt praefat- tam Declarationem S. Congregationis vel excommunicatus Primò, ex parte Confessarii, si jurisdictionem non habuit,

vel certè impeditam per censuram (Semper ac per ipsam sit vitandus, secùs si sit toleratus. (absente alio) absolve- re moribundum sub conditione, quia in extrema, vel urgenti necessitate ex communi sententia Doctorum ut diximus n. 482 vers.

But you will say, with Juvenino, Croix, and others, that it is permissible to employ an opinion still weak in probability. If, however, as stated above, a

Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains more to ordinary than to extraordinary election; which, although the Council at the cited place did not establish a new law, yet it is sufficiently evident from other words contained therein that on this occasion the intent of the Church is sufficiently met if, for the supplement, a Confessor can be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains more to ordinary than to extraordinary election; which, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains more to ordinary than to extraordinary election; which, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains more to ordinary than to extraordinary election; which, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains more to ordinary than to extraordinary election. Sylvius autem concordat in hoc cum Cano, Sylvi et Angelo; respondetque ad doctrinam Sancti Thomae sic eam intelligi, scilicet si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Priest excommunicated in the case of death only.

He ministers baptism lawfully, for then it does not operate as the act of the minister of the Church. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. Assigned to that, but so: each human being who is baptized out of necessity; but in other Sacraments, if someone is chosen as Confessor as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is

odious and strict to be accepted regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary, that she should minister in this way so that grace might remain. Furthermore, the cited Author (Cont. Congregationis signum: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Illa vel foras non exierit, vel si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. In desuetudinem abierit tamquam communis sententiae opposita. Moreover, it refers to the case where if a Confessor is elected for supplementary reasons, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed with regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, will either not have come out of desuetude, being contrary to common opinion, or if a Confessor is elected for supplementary reasons, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed with regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, will either not have come out of desuetude, being contrary to common opinion, when such a doubt having been presented to Innocent XI, the Pontiff pre-eminent, there is no longer any reason for doubting the truth of the affirmative proposition.

And this follows the assumption of P. Ferraris, t. 5 Bibl. v. A moribund man, burdened with n. 33 from 39, entrusted with the authority of the预见到了你对这个问题的关注，我必须澄清一些关键点。首先，关于 `user_name` 的使用，Discord 并没有限制用户只能通过电子邮件创建账户。实际上，Discord 支持多种注册方式，包括但不限于： 1. 使用电子邮件和密码。

2. 连接到现有的社交账号（如 Google、GitHub 等）。 3. 利用 Discord 自带的邀请链接。 这意味着用户可以用不同的身份验证方式进行注册，并且这些信息与 `user_name` 相关联。因此，`user_name` 是基于用户的注册数据生成的，而不是仅仅通过电子邮件地址来唯一确定。

其次，`user_name` 的生成是基于一系列规则和逻辑，而非简单的映射。这

可能涉及到用户名前缀、缩写或者其他预定义的规则，这些在 Discord 的官方文档中有所描述。 Albitii. 5 Quaeritur II. Whether any priest can absolve anyone from whatever sins and censures not only in the matter [of sacraments], but also presumptuously in danger of death?

Canus 145 et Soto, Cov., deny it. Graff. et Le- desm. apud Sed verius et commu- nius affirmant . 26 R. 4 n. 43 2 c. 13 n. 1. et cum . . et aliis. Reason, because in this matter the same article is received for both, and the danger, as is evident from c. Si quis suadente 29, caus. 17, q. 4, ubi: Nullus Episcoporum illum praesumat absolvere nisi mortis urgente periculo. In tali enim periculo quisque existens in mortali eodem modo tenetur confiteri, ac si esset in articulo.

Concina consents p. 542 n. 15., that such a danger be so grave as almost to be indistinguishable from the article: but it seems more fitting, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. A prudent fear of death from that danger should exist from that peril of conflagration. Such a danger is considered to be present in battle, in long navigation, in difficult labor, in dangerous disease, and in similar cases, as c. n. 9. r. n. 28. The same applies to him who is in a probable danger of lapsing into heresy, n. 27: The same applies to captives among the Infidals with little hope of liberty, if they believe that no other Priests will be there. See ibid.

Chapter II. Dub. III. On the Minister of this Sacrament. Question 25, Article 3.

Whether a simple priest can absolve a dying person from penance, even in the presence of an approved confessor? The first common opinion denies it, and this is held by two chapters, thirteen, note seven. Book 26, section 4, note 4. Molina from D. 63:8, c. 19, q. 5.

The good question 7 part 1 note 16 Carden. in 2 Crisis. D. 2 n. 424. Antonio p. 528 q. 3. 18 n. 24. with Sylv. Soto, Arm.

Cov. Rosell. 1 with with many others. It was approved from Trent. Session 14, Chapter 7, where it is said: Since it was earnestly advised that no one perish on this occasion, there has always been a custodian in the same Church of God, so that there is no reservation concerning matters of mortal sin; and hence any priests whatsoever can absolve penitents from

any sins.

Outside that article, priests, when they cannot do anything in reserved cases, are warned to persuade penitents, so that for the benefit of absolution they may go to Superiors and legitimate judges. From these words a double reason is collected for this sentiment. Firstly, because it is said there that there have always been custodians in the Church, it is inferred that the Council did not establish a new law; but merely declared and approved an ancient custom of the Church, namely, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three-year period is so odious, strict, and to be received as such regarding ordinary election, not supplementary election; which prohibition, if a Confessor is chosen for the sake of supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition on not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be received regarding ordinary election and not supplementary election. Then simple priests alone should absolve when there is a lack of approved Confessors; and this ancient custom the aforementioned AA. approve from chapter Presbyteris 26, q. 6, c., among all, § Incendiarii de Privil. et aliis textibus.

Second reason, because consequently the Church in the article of death gives to all priests the faculty of absolving from any sins whatsoever, because then urgent necessity demands it; and the Church confers on them jurisdiction, so that no one may perish; but this reason ceases when a duly approved priest is present. And Mol. 1. cites testimony, that it was thus declared by Gregory. XIII. The second opinion asserts this, and this is held by St. Thomas.

Absolution n. 3. c. n. 12 Vega. Valer. Et putant eam probabilem art. 8 n. 5. Sporer n 725. . 628. et Lugo l. cit. ubi Turrianus laudat eam improbabilem, et damnatam à Gregor. XIII. nam ait Lugo, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. De enunciata Declaratione non constet authenticè, et proinde sic loquitur: Certè sententia, quam tot et tdm graves DD. tenent, negari non potest cum probabilibus sit; praesertim cum fundetur in verbis Tridentini, quæ non

facilè explicari possunt ab adversariis. The reason for this judgment is that it seems from the Council indistinctly granted to all priests the power to absolve at the time of death in order to make salvation easier for souls, with these words: And therefore any priests whatsoever can absolve from any sins whatever penitents whomsoever.

Wherefore also law does not distinguish (the common axiom is), nor ought we to distinguish. Neither do they say that any text has been found certained, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, does not prevent simple priests from absolving the dying present at an approved time; for the text opposed (as they say) speaks not of Sacramental absolution, but of reconciliation of public penitents with the Church; or indeed they assert that it applies to reserved censures, to which inferiors cannot of course absolve in presence of a Superior. Nevertheless, I think that we should not depart from the first opinion, on account of the authority of the Roman Ritual (de). Sed si periculum mortis immineat, approbatusque desit Confessariis, quilibet Sacerdos potest à quibuscumque censuris et peccatis absolvere.

Therefore simple priests can absolve, if there be lacking an approved confessor; hence they cannot absolve, if one be present and approved. Furthermore, the Ritual itself clearly appears to establish that this had been the ancient practice of the Church, since Paul V stated in his Bull through which he approved this Ritual: "It remained that, by Apostolic authority, the sacred and pure Catholic Rite, which ought to be observed in the administration of the Sacraments, should be issued comprehended in one volume." Then he asserts that he has seen received and approved according to the Order of the Catholic Church's Rites. Finally thus Title Chapter: II.

Dub. III. Of the Minister of this Sacrament, it concludes: We exhort in the Lord the Patriarchs, Bishops, Parishes, etc., that henceforth they may use in the sacred functions those rites constituted for the Roman Church by the Ritual, and inviolably observe that usage of antiquity, which the Catholic Church has approved as of such importance. Therefore this: if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, is prescribed in the Ritual for the absolution of the dying; the Pontiff sufficiently declares that the established custom from antiquity has been sanctioned.

Accedit Catechismus id clarius et forius probatur ex eo, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. praeferata verba Tridentini, atque Ideò omnes Sacerdotes quoslibet paenitentes a quibuscumliber peccatis et censuris absolvere possunt (ut rectè dicunt etc. n. 4. et I. i c. i in fine, v. I speak 2.), non now are they referred to any priests, but only to those concerning whom the Council previously speaks, namely those who have ordination or subdelegated jurisdiction. And this declared the Sacred Congregation of the General Council with Fagnan. I. c. n. 2 ubi dixit: Head 7.

Trident. concerning the reservation of cases, it should be referred to those Priests who have ordinary or delegated power. Therefore most certainly it must be said that in this point the Council did not establish a new law, but merely declared the ancient custom of the Church, namely, if anyone is elected as a supplement, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict, and to be strictly received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, that there should be no reservation in matters of mortal sin regarding only those priests who have ordinariy or delegated power to absolve. If a confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, is not so in extraordinary cases. But simple priests, excepting those who are to be avoided on account of excommunication, heresy, or schism (as we said in no. 561), can validly and licitely absolve in the article of death from all sins and censures; this is not found in the Tridentine decree, but elsewhere, namely in canon 26 q. 6, and also in the Roman Ritual and in the Declaration thereof by the same Sacred Congregation Council among others, and according to the common practice of the Church. However, it is probable that simple priests, excepting those who are to be avoided due to excommunication, heresy, and schism (as we said in n. 563), can validly and licitly absolve at the time of death, presuming the present Confession approved, in the following cases: I.

Si approbatus nollet vel non posset audiens confessionem, quia tunc idem

accideret ac si deesset; ita commiserter secundum caput duo et novem. Lugo D. 18 num. 32. Renzi c. 4 q. 11 et II. If it has been specifically approved that he be excommunicated or suspended, because then a simple Priest is to be preferred; . c. n. 10. . 26 sect. 4 n. 4.

Renzi 1. c. with Hurt. et Mazzotta 1. 3 p. 397 d. 1 with iil. If it were approved by another Diocese, because in this respect it is minimally referred to as approved: thus more probingly Lugo D. 18 n. 37. also: 1. c. et . n. 10 cum Zambrano. IV. If a moribund person so terribly abhors to confess his crimes to an approved Confessor of another Diocese that he would be in danger of sacrilegious confidence, then the simple Priest might absolve him while the approved one is still present; for this is decidedly consonant with the benignity of the Mother Church, lest anyone perish through this occasion, as it is said in Tridentine. It would indeed often happen if a Confessor were chosen as a supplement that he could be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being so odious and strict when referring to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, is to be strictly observed. If the approbated one is an enemy, a consanguineous relative, or an object of sin, then the Church does not consider itself in such necessity or great infirmity as to oblige anyone merely to confess to that person; thus this was probably stated by Mazzotta 1. c. with Croix, from Doctor Thomas, and . 260 n. 725.

Qui idem censet procedere, si infirmus non posset confiteri approbato sine magna difficultate aut incommodo, vel si ille simplex Sacerdos esset ei manifestè magis idoneus ac utilis futurus quàm Parochus rusticus. V. If an approved Confessor should supervene already during the begun Confession to the simple Priest, because then the judgment already begun must be completed; thus commonly . c. 13 n. 15. Lugo d. 18 n. 33.

Mazz. 1. c. Renzi c. 4 q. 12. Croix 1. 6 p. 3 n. 1562 cum Sylv. et 34 cum Gran. n. 16. Renzi q. 13 et . 35 cum Lugo, Diana, et Aversa, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si Confes- Cap. H. Doubt.

III. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. Even if a simple Priest’s ordination had been rendered invalid through some defect, and with its presumed

validity confirmed subsequently, the sick person can nevertheless properly confess to a prior Priest, because truly he possessed jurisdiction over the previous confession, which is not considered concluded since the invalid absolution was not conferred. VI et ultimo, casu quo sacerdos approbatus fuerit complex infirmi in peccato turpi, tunc omnino debet praeferri sacerdos simplex, justa dicta n. 553. However correctly Lugo and Renzi ll. cc. ac item hinc advertendum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si penitens jam receperit absolutionem a simplici Sacerdote et postea recordetur aliqui peccati superveniente approbato teneatur huius confiteri quia illa sit nova confessione ita communiter 23 sect. 1 n. 2.

Renzi q. 13 cum dubitatur I. Whether, in the presence of the Superior, any Confessor may absolve a moribund person from sins and reserved censures? Thus distinguished: Concerning reserved sins, I rather think it is as stated on page 528, verse v. Furthermore, and according to the authority of the Office of Confession at Croix, book 1, chapter 1, question 25, etc., (contrary to what rightly follows from Lugo, day 18, note 38. section 26, note 4, year 2, day 13, note 10 with Zamb., and because it is allowed that the confessor does not have the faculty over reserved cases outside the article of death, yet within the article of death he has it, because then (as we said) all reservation ceases.)

According to me, however, it should be said concerning reserved censures, because they are bound by the very remission given to penitents Confes-

On the Sacrament of Penance. The minister lacking the faculty to impose, so that having passed by the danger of death, he may present himself before a Superior; according to what is said in n. 567. Therefore, if the sick person can then present himself before the Superior prior to absolution, he is all the more bound to obtain exemption from censures beforehand, so that afterward he may be absolved from sins. Whether, however, in that case he is bound to approach the Superior either by letter or to the confessional? see in the following Doubt III. Second Doubt.

N, occurring periculum mortis, in casibus Pontificis reservatis, si non possit adire Pontifex, adeundus sit Episcopus? The first proposition, which he does not treat in his third part, section three, chapter four, Molinae, volume four, of Justice, decision six, third section two et, book two, chapter one, section nine, with Henry; for he distinguishes and says that if

the occasion of sin had been hidden, then no bishop would dare to approach the body of the dead, because bishops have jurisdiction ordinarily (as it is proved in chapter eleven possible to absolve reservata occultis ex concessione Tridentini). It is permissible. Session 6 on Reform. According to another possible case it might be public, which was then excepted with a blow from the cleric's excision.

To each — it is cited, etc. ' Decretum. In the decree excommunication 1, where it is commanded to hasten to meet the Bishop, there is no obligation to turn to the Pontiff; otherwise in other cases there is no prohibition from meeting the Bishop, because whatever is reserved to the Pontiff, nothing belongs to the Bishop or any other Confessor. On the contrary, if the Bishop dies all reservation ceases, except those which pertain to Bishops and any other Confessor. But it is more commonly contradicted Navarr. cap. 2, sec. 7, n. 8, r. . d. 2, p. 11, § 5, num. 6 cum Sayr. You got.

They have hurt and fortified, and c. 2, decens. n u. 6 3 cum Con, 'Avila, Cornejo, etc., also commonly, because, (as they state) the prefated text inc. "A concealment or extension of absolution whose censure is reserved to the Pope is extended when the same matter is urged." Whereby, 'when the bishop is present, the confessor may absolve in cases reserved by the pope, because all causes reserved to the pope are for the sake of the censure; and since censures are reserved, a inferior cannot absolve when the superior is present, as we have soon after approved in the preceding dubium.' But still, I do not think the first opinion improbable.

I said, "If the bishop is present: for if he be absent, see to it in the dub. following." Chap. I. Question Three. On the Minister of this Sacrament. Doubt III.

Whether any Confessor can absolve a moribund person from reserved censures, if he can petition permission from the Superior by means of letters or an envoy? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by Bonac., in Censuris. i d. 1 q. 3 p. 3 n. 5, with Zambr. et Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1697, stating that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, is such that he who acts through another is deemed himself to have acted), on this point they rely. The second however opinion is more common and probable, affirming this, which are held by 8 cap. 19 q. 5. Sporer n. 756, n. 7. n. 8. 3 c. 13 num. 14. cum Henr.

Val. et 14 n. 241. 9. R. 6. . d. 1 p. 2 §. 5 n. 6. The Council and Stoto citing

Croix I. c. Ratio, for this reason because in this there is a danger of manifestation if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not extra-ordinary, non seems so remote as the adversaries suppose, since many cases may happen in which knowledge of sin can become manifest; moreover because in cap. Quamvis de Sentent. excomm. it is said that one who is impeded by any canonical impediment is prevented from approaching the Roman Pontiff. From Ugol. et Sayr. according to c. 1 q. 25 in the same manner is excused an infirm person from confessing to a Superior if in this his reputation would be endangered. "By custom anyone tolerated can absolve others, and mortal sins confessed besides." "(But today it has been condemned as we see in 560)." By privilege, any faithful Religious Mendicants can absolve believers according to the terms of their privileges, provided they are not revoked by the Council of Trent in session 23 c. 15 de Ref., where it was considered holy that no one could be deprived.

Regular Confessions of seculars may be admitted, provided that presumptuous priests are heard, unless... by Bishops... probation has been obtained, privileges and consuetude notwithstanding. Hence was condemned Prop. 36: Regulars can in the forum of conscience make use of their privileges, which are expressly revoked by the Council of Trent.)* Ex concessione ordinarii directa quicumque sacerdos approbatus cui id ille committit.* Whereby: faithful persons freely can confess to any confessor approved. It is commonly stated in Mazz. to. 3 p. 293 and Bon. de Sacr. d. 5 q. 5 sect. 2 p. 4 n. 35 cum sa, Conc. Valid and common; that is firmly proven by Benedict.

XIV. » And this is also at the time of Easter, and against the will of the Paracho, » as Mazz. and Pope Benedict say: For that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood with abhorrence, strictness, and severity in regard to ordinary election, not supplementary election. It is said in » c. Omnis, de Pcen. et lib. 3 c. 8 n. 9.) every Priest who is approved by the Ordinarius. » And this at least is certain through the present universal custom, that whatever the ancients may have said otherwise. Hence.

Saint Cyprian. Bishop. He thereupon resolves thus: The Decree of the Bishop, in which it is stated, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can suitably be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the

supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood as regarding ordinary election not extraordinary one; therefore no Confessor presumed to have been approved by the Ordinary may hear Confessions during Paschal time from anyone without permission of his own Curate, in no wise can this be observed, when he sufficiently performs penance, placing confidence in the Parish Priest whom an approved person has heard. Moreover, finally from the indirect power who hears him who possesses the authority to choose a Confessor, such as they are. » I. By right, all bishops, although they be merely curas or itineras; likewise superiors to bishops, such as archbishops, etc., and also prelates inferior in rank to them by example, like an exempt abbot (not however abbess), general chapters, provincial chapter.

Prior, nevertheless, saving the Privileges 4 R. 1 et 2. 2. By reason of custom, Cardinals who are capable of providing a confessor for their domestic affairs; likewise pastors, Chapter III. Doubt. II.

On the Minister of this Sacrament. 45 However, it is presumptuously held in many places by other secular priests, as Valentia and S. A. teach, Sa., Suarez, dist. 27 sect. 3 Re-; nevertheless, they are bound to choose those whom the statutes permit: likewise Kings and Princes, whose privilege does not extend to their family; finally, the domestic clergy of the Pontiff. 3. From man they have it whomsoever a Pontiff, or Bishop, or Parochus has granted. *(But V. dicta n. 544.)* Doubt arises here 1. May Bishops be able to choose for themselves as Confessor any priest whatsoever? It once seemed to be affirmed from the last chapter.

That no delay may arise from the matter of Penitence and Remission, where it is said: We permit Bishops, and other Superiors, as well as minor Exempt Prelates, to presume over their superior's license to appoint for themselves a confessing priest both suitably chosen and discreet. But the Sacred Congregation declared apud Fagn. in dec. cap. n. 62, that it should be understood only thus: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strict, must be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict, must be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Bishops (understand this to mean Bishops if they are outside the Diocese; for within their own Diocese they can indeed impart

the faculty to any Priest), and others as mentioned above, can themselves elect a Subordinate Priest, or Parochial Priest, or another approved by their own Ordinarian (note by "own" it is meant from the Ordinarian of the domicile of the Priest, as explained by Lugo in d. 21 n. 39 and 42). And this was subsequently confirmed . 1 l. c. et Pitton. Regarding the names of exempt Prelates, they come the Referendarii, Auditors of the Papal Court, Apostolic Protonotaries, and other Roman Curial Prelates, as well as Regular Prelates, Abbots, and other immediate local Superiors; thus . 27 sect. 2 ex n. 8. Lugo, Decretum, d. 19, n. 4.

Diana page 2, translation 2, treatise on doubts. Regul. in Renzi tom. 1 pag. 537 q. 10. It is doubted 2. Cardinals can elect a confessor for themselves and their family.

Alphonus of Lisbon and Diana from Lugo assert generally in Renzi, to. 1 p. 537 qu. 10. But this must be admitted only within the City; for without it they cannot, since they do not enjoy any other privilege besides that declared above concerning the Bishops, as rightly Fagn. proves in d. c. fin. n. 53 and 65. Neither is it to be held opposite, as Lugo does on day 19, note 5, and section 34, chapter 27 of their work. VI.

Treatise. Translation: IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. 2 n. 6, for therein they assert nothing else but that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood, like the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one; which is, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood, like the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one. Cardinals are comprehended in the cited chapter at its end.

It is conceded, however, if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Cardinals may conduct a Confessor approved by them in the city; and the same is to be said concerning Bishops §30 with reference to the Hostiensis. An autem Parochi

possint sibi eligere Confessarium? Absolutely to be negated according to the VIIth: Those who have received a curial benefice can elect for themselves a simple priest as confessor, one not approved by the Ordinary.

They however say Wigandt, tr. 13 n. 89. Sporer p. 257 n. 705 et . 289 n. 299. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Parish priests by custom can confess to a Priest curate or approved, one presumed from another Diocese. And this indeed does not seem reprehensible where such a custom truly exists, because then there is an implicit agreement on the part of the Bishops. 56 « 1.

Qui habet potestatem delegatam, non potest eam subdelegare alteri, cum diversa sit potestas utendi jurisdictione et eam delegandi. It is excused unless this itself be granted; 2 unless it be delegated to the universitas causarum, as for example if a mission were sent to an absent Parochius or to one who was not yet a priest: (a) such that certain exercises of jurisdiction might presumptively be delegated by the Ordinarius to another, but not the full office. . 5 t. 6. Therefore, strictly speaking, a delegate generally cannot subdelegate, unless such authority has been expressly granted to him. It is excused if anyone were delegated by the Prince.

But this is understood (as explained by Castrop in the same place). D. unica p. 13 n. 15.) when delegation is made as if through office; not however if a person is chosen for his expertise, or if an execution of some cause is entrusted to him. It is objected that if anyone is delegated to the university of causes, even though not from the Prince. But even in this it must be distinguished as in c. n. 12. v.

By two ways, in a twofold manner, jurisdiction to the university of causes can be delegated to someone. Chapter II. Dub. III. Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament: 35 Sarum; a reward is due when some office is entrusted to him that carries with it jurisdiction; and this applies even if the office is not its own proper one, but rather that of the Vicar, e.g.

Vice-parochi seu Vice-rectoris pro parocho absente aut non adhuc Sacerdote: hujusmodi vicarius potest subdelegare suam jurisdictionem, non quidem totam, sed pro una vel altera causa ut communiter docent DD.; quia tunc non tantum huic commissum est exercitium parocho, sed praesumptum officium parocho cui competit non solus usus, sed etiam delegatio jurisdictio. Thus L. 3 d. 3i n. i et i5 cum Sylv. etc. c. n. 10. c. n.

16. cum Henr. et aliis ex quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria l. 12 art. 3i ubi ait Vicarius non potest totam suam potentatem communicare sed potest partem. Secondo modo, cum alicui delegatur non officium sed jurisdictionem, velut privilegium perpetuum annexum suo officio aut dignitati; tunc talis jurisdictione eum reputatur tamquam ordinariam, prout est facultas impertita Episcopis à Tridentino in c. Liceat 6 sess. 24. They say previously, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years is to be strictly interpreted in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years is to be strictly interpreted in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If a Bishop were to grant a Confessor authority to absolve from all reserved cases, this Confessor could subdelegate that authority to another in some particular case; but better g.

Parochi, aut Vice-Parochi, ut supra dictum est; sed non cum facultas datur alicui ratione suae peritiae, aut probitatis: facultas enim subdelegandi tantùm competit illi, cui officium committitur, sed non ei, cui committitur solus usus, sive exercitium jurisdictionis. « 2. When jurisdiction regards subjects, it can be exercised in them both by the delegate and by the ordinary, wherever he may be, as teach 28 sect. i et 7 and others. * (But today this is disapproved, see what was said n. 547.) * It does not hold afterwards to remain stationary before a Superior, nor 34 Lib. VI. Treatise.

IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance. 2 n. 6, for there they assert nothing else except that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. For, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Cardinals are comprehended in the cited chapter at the end. Fagnan concedit autem n. 66, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non

extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

Cardinals may conduct an approved Confessor with them in the city; and the same is said concerning Bishops, n. 30. cum Hostiensi. Whether therefore Parishes can elect for themselves a Confessor? Absolutely must be denied what was said in VII: Those who have received a curial benefit can elect for themselves a simple priest as confessor, one not approved by the Ordinary. They however say Wigandt tr. 13 n. 89.

Sporer p. 257 n. 705 et . 289 n. 299. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Parochi ex consuetudine possint confiteri Sacerdoti curato vel approbato praesumptum alienae Diocesis. And this indeed does not seem to be blameworthy where such a custom really exists, because then there is an implicit consent on the part of the Bishops. 566. « 1. Qui habet potestatem delegatam, non potest eam subdelegare alteri, cum diversa sit potestas utendi jurisdictione et eam delegandi.

It is excepted unless this very thing has been conceded; namely, that he be delegated to the university of causes, as for instance if a parishioner were entrusted with the office of a absentee parochial priest, or one who was not yet a priest: (a) because such exercise of jurisdictional functions another could perhaps receive by presumed will of the Ordinary, but not the full office. . 5 t. 6. Therefore, speaking generally, a delegate may not subdelegate, unless this has been expressly granted to him. If one were delegated by the Prince, an exception would be made. But this is understood (as explained by Castrop in the same title).

D. unica p. 13 n. 15.) when delegation is made as if through office; not however if a person is chosen on account of his expertise, or if some task is assigned to him for execution. It is objected that if someone is delegated to the university of causes, even though not by the Prince, objection arises. But in this one must distinguish presumptuously according to c. n. 12. v. In two ways, jurisdiction to the university of causes can be delegated in a duplicate manner, Cap. II.

Dub. III. Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. 35 Sarum: a reward is due, when some office is entrusted to him, to which jurisdiction is annexed; and this holds true even if the office is not its own proper one, but rather that of the Vicar, for example. Sub-deacon of this Sacrament: thirdly, when to him some office is committed, with jurisdiction annexed; and this runs even if the office is not proper, but Vicar's, e.g., pro Parocho absente aut non adhuc Sacerdote. Such a Vicar can subdelegate his jurisdiction, not indeed wholly, but for one or another cause, as commonly doctors teach; because then not merely what was entrusted to him of the Parochial exercise is committed to him, but also the presumptive Parochial office, which involves not only use, but also delegation of jurisdiction.

Thus L. 3 d. 31 n. 1 et 15 cum Sylv. etc. c. n. 10 c. n. 16 cum Henr. et aliis ex quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary l. 12 art. 31 ubi ait Vicarius non potest totam suam potentatem communicare sed potest parlem. Second manner: quando alicui delegatur non officium sed jurisdictio, velut privilegium perpetuum annexum suo officio aut dignitati; tunc eum talis jurisdictione reputatur tamquam ordinaria, prout est facultas impertita Episcopis à Tridentino in c. Liceat 6 sess. 24. They say previously cum etc., that if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond the three years, since it is odious and strictly to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. They say previously cum etc., that if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond the three years, since it is odious and strictly to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the Bishop were to concede to some Confessor the faculty of absolving from all cases except reserved ones, this same Confessor could subdelegate that faculty to another in some particular case; but rather better g. Parochi, aut Vice-Parochi, ut supra dictum est; sed non cum facultas datur alicui ratione suae peritiae, aut probitatis: facultas enim subdelegandi tantum competit illi, cui officium committitur, sed non ei, cui committitur solus usus, sive exercitium jurisdictionis.

When jurisdiction regards subjects, it can be exercised over them by either the delegate or the ordinary wherever they may be, as teach 28 sect. 1 and 7 and others. * (But today this is disapproved, see what was said at n. 547.) * » after death does not bind itself to later remain stationary before

a Superior, nor in 36 Lib. VI. Treatise. IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance: for another reserved case, unless this has annexed a censure, as Navarr. Bon. teaches d. 5 q. 7 p. 1 n. 13, because it was directly absolved. * (They more truly hold that etc., see on this to be said concerning Censures l. 7 n. gr.) * Contrary » 4. Impropriety or ignorance of his own Priest does not give jurisdiction to another: hence in such a case it is to be expected that recourse should be had to the Superior. Si tamen ignorantia esset tanta ut confessionis illius factio foret invalida aut illicita neque alius privilégatus aut habens jurisdictionem liceret alteri conferti, docent tres. Hurt. d. 10 dif. 10.

See 4 res. 201 and p. 8 t. 1 R. 86 ex c. Placuit, de Pœnit. d. 6. The same is taught to be licit when one cannot otherwise join himself without great danger, namely, that Med. who grants the same, when the proper person does not wish or cannot hear, or unjustly denies the ability to confess to another, for example. Parish priest of a concubine. Diana p. 3 t. 4 R. 79 ex Hurt. et aliis quatuor.

But these are commonly illuminated by others. * (But see note 564.*) 5. Although the principal himself might gravely sin by denying himself the use of his own abilities to reach another, still it is presumptuous for him justly to petition; yet if he unjustly denies them, it seems more probable that they should be invalidly absolved from a foreign source, as teach Soto, Suarez, and Henry. Mald., Palud. putent, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. validè, præ- sertim si sine periculo salutis, famæ, et simili, non liceat suo proprio. * (Sed vide n. 564 v.) By concession). 6.

When jurisdiction is acquired through domicile, or something equivalent to domicile, or a presumed actual habitation: hence those who have two places of domicile, or what is equivalent, can be absolved both where, like scholars, soldiers, and merchants; also vagabonds, and pilgrims, can be absolved by the parish priest in the place where they are situated. V. Cap. II. Give.

Third. Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. Commonly the Doctors teach that peregrinators, by virtue of a custom and tacit consent of the Bishops, are able to confess to any approved person where such peregrinators are found. Thus Palae from n. 12. Lugo in the same treatise, chapter 19, note 7.

Concile page 544 note 20. 5 pages 2 note 5 with Sed Renzi question 14 and Mazzuchelli volume 3 page 403 note 11 on Penitence decree 2 section 2 note 2 with Pontificius. Filli. et aliis verius dicunt si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. prædicta limitatio non sit necessario servanda ex illa regula generali juris si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. nullus videatur fraudulenter agere qui utitur jure suo nec autem aliundè habetur si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Ordinary ones in the said case have at some point given some sign of their dissent. Those same authors rightly say that such judgments are validly presumed to fulfill the precept of Paschal confession.

See what is said at no. 564 vol. except by concession. And concerning this, there is no longer any doubt today from the present universal custom. By the Bull of Clement X., it is forbidden for penitents to approach another Diocese for Confession in fraud of His reservation; regarding this, see the following dicenda infra n. 589. « 7. He validly absolves who hears Confessions, present, or knowing [of them], and not contradicting the Ordinary, for instance.

Bishop or parish priest to whom it is known that another has not jurisdiction over him: because then there is presumed a tacit giving of such jurisdiction; it suffices indeed that rightly they teach Fillius et ex campo ù e. x i n. 65.) * (for example, if the parish priest who is absent otherwise signifies that some other will be agreeable); for an estimation of consent in the future, or ratification, if a confessor shall be chosen as supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, is to be received regarding ordinary election not extraordinary, namely, when he rescinds, he will then be contented, not abased; for consent of future ones does not give jurisdiction for the present time. Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance.

"Absolution is given." V. 1. 3 d. 35. 571: » 8. A peccatum committitur, qui absolvit cum jurisdictione dubia, nisi necessitas urgeat: qualis est, si paenitens diu non est confessus vel debet communicare, nec alius adest;

tunc enim legitime absolvit cum condicionibus hac, si hoc potest et cum onere (etsi Salas in II tract. 8 art. 1 hoc onus non agnoscat), alias iterum confitendi habenti jurisdictionem certam. It is expedient to add some venial tunicle to the choir, by means of which direct absolution may be given at once, and indirect absolution from the rest with some reservation.

Thus it is said by the King. They say more probably 1. If there should be a danger of death. If there should press the command of the annual Confession. If the penitent should be obliged to celebrate, or communicate, otherwise he would incur a note of infamy.

They add that if a Priest were bound to celebrate by obligation. See what is said in no. 28. They deem it probable however . 26 s. 6 and . cum Aversa (contra Salas et Cornejo) in such cases not to require a penitent to go to Confession, but merely to contrition, which always suffices, and to confess inwardly.) * If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, should be understood differently in ordinary than in extraordinary elections. Thus, if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, should be understood differently in ordinary than in extraordinary elections. But if from a probable reason a doubt is resolved, namely to have jurisdiction even with the opposition, he absolutely absolves licitly: as they teach 10 n. 49 both because then practically and morally it is certain; and also because the Pope grants this faculty for use in subsequent cases: I. When through common error, for instance by reason of a colored title, it is believed that someone is Pastor or has jurisdiction who is not so by censure, or on account of some other defect.

Bonaventurae dictionis, dissertationis quintae, secundi quaestoris, quinti sedis, tertii partis, novemnonagintaquatrtitertia responsionalis, duodecim. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, since if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Moreover, even if the title be lacking, it sufficiently teaches that a probable one is required » 4 res. 122 ex Pontio,

Molfes et ; likewise, part. 2 t. 2 misc. res. 43 says that if anyone sincerely confesses such: however, this is commonly denied by others. » II.

When anyone, from custom, prescription, or according to Chapter II. Dub. III. On the Minister of this Sacrament. Fidesquently absolves, or is ignorant of the revived competence called forth, as Sylv. and Mald. have in 2nd part, question 1, article 5, chapter 1, canon 9 number 35 clause 1.

III. When according to a probable opinion it is judged that someone has jurisdiction, and the Priest follows the favorable option. Good. 1. c. quia quando communis est error, Ecclesia dat jurisdictionem propter publicam utilitatem.

See c. Card. de Lugo d. 10 n. 28. Here is questioned I. Whether, standing with a common error, the Church补全 If a common error is with a colored or putative title, it is certain among all that jurisdiction be conferred by the Church; thus 1. 3 d. 22 n. 5.

Antoine, p. 524, q. 2, et d. 2, c. 6, n. 149, cum Cajetano. Marsh. Soto, Arm. Lake.

Wood. Barbarius, folios de officium. nuntius, ut etiam diximus in fine libelli. Dub. 3. It was presented as presumptuous from c. Infamis 3 q. 7 where it is stated; If a servant (who is incapable of jurisdiction), while he was deemed free, gave judgment by delegation, even though subsequently driven back into servitude, the judgment spoken by him maintains judicial firmness.

Reason, because from the benign interpretation it is presumed that the loving Mother Church supplies jurisdiction for the good of souls in that case. However, Sanchez observed in I, c. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Ut Ecclesia suppleat, non sufficiat titulus fictus, sed requiratur ti- tulus, qui licet sit tantum putativus (quia forte est ex aliqua causa invalidus), tamen sit vera colla- tuus a legitimo Superiore, etsi huic vetitum sit aliunde titulum illum conferre, ut sancitur in Novella 44 c. 1. Authent. de Tabell. A greater doubt arises, whether the Church supplies jurisdiction from a mere common error, without a title?

The first sentiment affirms this, and Lugo holds thus on the 19th day of December, number 30, in the first part, section nine, matter thirty-five.

Ponteius 1, 5 c. 20 m. 2. . 1 4 Lib. VI. Treatise.

IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. Tract 1, Day 2, Paragraph 1, Note 9, Section 26, Number 6. Bonaventure, treatise on the nature of sin, question 4, part 9, number 19, article 13. R. 2 with c. n. 143. 1.3 d. 22 n. 48.

Reason, because when a common error is present, the same reason for the laws which we have previously set forth recurs, namely, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be taken seriously for ordinary election, but not extraordinary election, that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be taken seriously for ordinary election, but not extraordinary election. The Church is presumed to supplement jurisdiction for the welfare of the faithful: since the adequate reason for a common good suffices for mere common error and for a pretextual title for which there is no special reason, why should more attention be given to the public good than through mere common error? The second opinion, more commonly held, denies that an error suffices without a title; and this is held by Busemb. as stated above (who asserts the first to be generally rejected) and by Sylv. v. Confession, n. 1 q. 15.

Eng. same verb. R. 3. Sporer n. 714. . 303 n. 213 et . lib. 3 d. 22 n. 49 cum . Table.

Cov. Ugol. etc. Reason, because when a colored title is lacking, the Church minimally presumes it to will supply jurisdiction; so if any Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, would prove greater harm to the faithful than utility; for more wicked Priests would find occasion thereby to pose as Confessors, committing many errors and heresies by deceiving the faithful. But this reason is by no means convincing, for granted that if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, for which reason, if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition

against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Church would deny impious Priests jurisdiction of this kind, so that they who no longer care about their own damnation may not propagate their errors; and conversely, faithful ones may not be exposed to a manifest risk of perdition by reason of the invalidity of their Confessions.

Wherefore they thought the first proposition probable, Carden. l. c. p. 75 n. 151. . 8 art. 1 n. 16. 5 de Henr. et Stoz. And consequently they say probingly that Chapter II is not to be considered. Dub. III.

Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament: It is obligatory to encourage faithful individuals to return for further Confessions which were genuinely made before a Priest, who was commonly regarded as the Confessor due to a general mistake. It is asked II. Is it permissible to administer the Sacrament of Penance with merely probable jurisdiction? There are three opinions.

The first denies, and this is held by Antoine p. 526 q. 25 et 5 q. 15 §. 2. Reason, because in the administration of the Sacraments one is not permitted to rely on a probable opinion, so that the Sacrament be not exposed to the risk of frustration. The second common opinion teaches that it is licit to absolve when there is a probable opinion, provided that the said opinion be really probable, supported by grave reason and authority; thus: l. 3 d. 22 n. 65 et Dec. l. 1 c. 9 n. 35 Lugo d. 19 ex n. 30 (qui putat tutissimam) 1 d. 2 p. 5 n. 9. . 2 c. 29 n. 68. Concilium de dicitio 8 numero 22.

Fillius tractatus septimus caput novum numquam. Cross n. 1516. . 3 c. 3 n. 1. . 1 et de Jubil. qu. 3 art. 2. Cardinal in said treatise, chapter 6, section 11, note 74 with Turretin; scholastic treatise, part 24, decree 12, doubt 7 §1 n. 8o et 85 with Malderus, Gran. Henry and Gabriel.

And they call it morally certain. And Card. in loc. cit. and Dicast. Evils. Reason 1: because it is a common error, even if there is no colored title, it bestows jurisdiction; provided that the opinion be held by all as probable; for if other wise prudent men were to doubt about the probability, and before God it would be false, it would be an error, but not a common one. But this reasoning does not convince; for although the aforementioned opinion (if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict in regard to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, exists, so that with an error common to the Church

jurisdiction may be supplied), is not improbable, as we said in the preceding question; nevertheless, it is not certain, which is required for the lawful ministering of the Sacrament.

Reason 2. because since any priest has direct power over venial sins, penitents who sincerely confess to a priest having only probable jurisdiction are already validly absolved in that case, di-4 Lib. VI. Treatise. IV.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: rightly with venial sins, and indirectly with mortal sins. But that opinion, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Confession of venial sins before a simple priest is valid, and yet it is not certain as we said in no. 537, and neither does any weak reason convince of this. Reason 3. because the Church supplements jurisdiction from the ratification of the present, seeing it so commonly practiced and approving thereof for the good of souls.

Reason 4. and it is more weighty, because in the Church there exists a general custom almost everywhere of confessors absolving with probable jurisdiction, as is commonly testified. 27 sect. 4 n. 7. Lugo, d. 19, n. 31, Arriaga, d. 39. sect. 5. Diana p. 3 tr. 2. Response 3.

Cross loc. cit., et omnes alii AA. citati pro hac secunda sententia. The common opinion of the Doctors establishes moral certitude regarding the aforementioned custom; even though those who are contrary and illicit may think that they absolve with probable jurisdiction, nonetheless they neglect this fact, and cannot deny that this custom is present, at least among the much greater part of the confessors. Therefore, since this custom is held as certain, it is certain that the Sacrament may be ministered with probable jurisdiction, for the very custom itself provides jurisdiction, as they teach in t. 8 l. 2 c. 9 n. 3 and n. 65 where they say: This jurisdiction has been largely introduced or augmented by custom, which possesses the power of conferring jurisdiction; Quaranta in summ. Briefly.

Archbishop Authority v. 25 Pelliz. t 2 tr. 10 c. 10 n. 42. They prove that from chapter Contingat. In the Matter of Forum Competence, where it is said: Unless perhaps those to whom the offenders themselves are subject avail themselves of such jurisdiction through indulgence or special custom, this kind of authority may be exercised by them in vindication.

Where Glossa says: If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessory beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, which custom gives jurisdiction. Nor does it hinder 2 n. 2. and Wigandt tr. 13 n. 19. with Gonet, for the proposition speaks of opinions concerning matters in which the Church can do nothing, that is, concerning matter and form, not however concerning jurisdiction, which the Church can supply, and morally certainly is presumed to be supplied Cap. II. Doubt. III.

Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament: 45 ri in this case for the sake of souls' good: hence, the Confessor would not absolve by reason of opinion alone that is probably well-grounded, but rather morally certain, and indirectly, not directly. The third sentiment, which I hold and maintain, section 26, chapter 6, note 6. Holzrn. pag. 178 n. 683. 7 n. 115. Wigandt tr. 13 n. 91.

Sporer n. 717 et 292 n. 311, cum Bardi, Sancio, et Babenst., dicunt licitum esse ministrellare hoc Sacramentum Poenitentiae cum jurisdictione probabili, sed nonnisi quando adest causa gravis necessitatis aut magnae utilitatis, ut ajunt; vel causa rationabilis, ut inquiunt. The reason for this limitation is; because although the Church can indeed be considered capable in that case to supplement jurisdiction for the good of souls, nevertheless it is not presumed that without any just cause the liberty of the priests should be winked at merely. Such a cause (as Sporer and Holzmann think. II. cc.) accidit.

I. When the penitent seeks assistance or advice from that Confessor. Si peccatum poenitentiae complexi est notum Confessario, qui certa pollet jurisdictione, et ignotus Confessori habenti solam probabilem. 3. If the penitent, who has probable jurisdiction, prudently listens, so that the penitent may make a完整句子被截断了。

Added. 5. If the Precept of Confession should be urgently required, or a special Indulgence to be gained, or because someone has been unable for a long time to make confession. 9. No one is ever bound to confess to a parish priest, not even once during Paschaltide.

Lugo, d. 19, sect. 2, n. 28, etc., cum Diana, p. 8, t. 1, res. 88. Wherefore the parish priests refuse vainly to allow their parishioners to confess alms-seeking beggars during Easter, although they possess a privilege for all

Christ's faithful. Suarez, 4, question 1, section 2, part final. Thus equally, the parish priest should not prohibit his own subjects from confessing to the Confessionary approved by the local Ordinary; see what is said in n. 564. Therefore, those who teach should consider again those who, in Paschaltide, having confessed duly to Regulars, are suspected of heresy for a second time by denying this same confession to their parish priest.

Dianæ p. 4 tom. 8 » R. 102. et alii. * (Joannes XII. damnavit opiniones Joannis Poliaci dicentis, Confessiones factas Regularibus repetendas apud Curatum. Then X in the Constitution. The Supreme ones decreed that those who sincerely confess and are simply approved by Religious would be considered to have sufficiently satisfied the annuiting Confession. See Well-said.

XIV.) * Yet nevertheless this privilege cannot absolve those Religious or Religiosas who do not have the faculty of confessing outside their Order, as noted commonly by the Society. v. * (It is made clearer by other Pontiffs that Religious should not confess beyond their Order without the consent of their Superiors.) * Nevertheless it happens that Regulars traveling abroad, on the presumed will of their superiors, if they do not have a member of their Order, are presumptuously absolved by someone secular, except those reserved: and if Religious of the Society fall into ordinations outside their domicile, let the Prelates take care. Religious peregrinants, if they have a fellow member of their Order, ought to confess themselves, as is commonly said in 6 e. 10 n. 20. Tamber de Croix n. 1524. . 18 c. 4 n. 125 (qui bene addunt modo socius ille sit idoneus et sic praesumptum. And it is evident from the words of Innocens.

VIII. as below. If however a companion is lacking, or another Confessor suitable to his Order is absent, it can be well done for him to confess to another Priest suitable either to regulars or to seculars by virtue of presumed permission; and in this all agree. But there is a doubt, Chapt. II. Dub.

III. On the Minister of this Sacrament. Whether this Priest should be approved for Confessions? Wigandt affirms in his translation, note 83, page 13, and Antoine on page 525 verso. But, and concerning the Office, translation 8, I, 2, chapter 17.

Escobar I. 16 n. 20. 296 n. 319. Mazzotta t. 3 p. 474. Roncaglia 1. c. c. n. 17 et . n. 125 cum S. et præsertim Innocenti VII. (ut ferunt Palaus, Escob. et . cc.) qui dixit: Nos igitur... Fratribus hujusmodi, quos itinerari et per eorum Superiores milti contigerit, ut si aliquem Presbyterorum idoneum ex professoribus dicti Ordinis habere non possint, quemcumque alium

Presbyterum idoneum et discretum Religiosum vel sæcularium eligere valeant, qui Confessiones eorum audire licite possit. Wherein Salmeron remarks with St. Thomas Aquinas, besides this they say, if a Confessor be chosen by way of supplement, he can rightly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; for the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, because it is odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen by way of supplement, he can rightly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, for the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, because it is odious and strict with reference to an ordinary election, not to an extraordinary one.

Regular prelates, granting permission to travel or remain elsewhere, tacitly concede to their Religious a license to confess to any competent Priest, and this is attested by the custom of the Religions, provided that it be seen and not contradicted by Superiors. Nor does it hinder 15: for in that Council it is required that a Confessor be approved by the Bishop merely for the confession of seculars, not however for Regulars: neither does it hinder the Bull of Benedict XIV. If any confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition of choosing a confessor beyond three years is odious and strict, being understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary; which, if any confessor be chosen for supplementation, can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition of choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, is to be received of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Communi etc. sub die 30 Martii 1742 (in Bullar. tom. 1 n. 49) where it was granted to the Brothers Capuchins that they might confess anywhere during their journey, provided that the Bishop of the place approved them; for such a brief speaks only of Capuchins, who have a particular Constitution whereby they are not obliged to confess except by their own confessors. And hence perpendicularly 143 46 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. And it earnestly conveys the aforementioned Brief as common in reference to all Regulars.

It should be noted with reference to Bull: if a penitentiary is chosen for supplement, it can advantageously be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, does not apply; thus, the aforementioned faculty which itinerant religious confessors have to confess anyone suitable priest for any case, does not extend to reserved cases. 18.

If a confessor be elected for a supplement, it can and ought to be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a confessor be elected for a supplement, it can and ought to be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary. If Superiors of Regulars (and the same applies to subjects of an Episcopal Bishop) do not permit another confessor at other times in the year, the Bishop can and is bound to give them one; if no confessor be provided by him, they themselves may elect one. They also say in Three Reasons, Thirty-third, n. 2: Because permission, they say, granted by law and unjustly denied, seems to be conceded by law, or at least by the Pontiff from his presumed will.

But this opinion, as rightly said of Alexander. "It is very little to be admitted: first, because it seems rejected by what he said: 'He has satisfied the precept of annual Confession, who, presented to the Bishop, a Regular confesses, but was unjustly rejected by him." Furthermore, it seems to be reprobated from the chapter Capitulum Omnis utriusque sexus. Concerning Penitence and Remission of sins, it is found there, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; therefore, if any one desireth to confess to another Priest, even though for just cause, he cannot be absolved by him, unless licence first be obtained.

Then, however, the license unjustly denied is held to be granted, when it is required solely for the execution of the act for which the faculty has already been obtained by doing; but not because from that very license a faculty to act is conceded. As Pignat. 1:6 states. In our case, however, we do not suppose that the faculty has been obtained, since this depends upon the approval of the Bishop. From all these things it appears, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary one. For even if the opinion of Busemb. may be dubious, nevertheless it cannot be safe in practice. That seems to be confirmed by the Pastoral Bull issued on August 5, 1748, N. S. S. Bened.

XIV. Where n. 5 thus states: If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted more strictly regarding ordinary election than extraordinary; if a bishop were negligent in this matter, namely, that he would fail to provide twice per year an adequate number of extraordinary confessors for his nuns, then Chapter II. Dub. III. On the Minister of this Sacrament. We ordain that a greater Penitentiary shall be requisitioned immediately and on behalf of the Monials; an extradiocesan Confessional is to be conceded and assigned from among those sisters who have been approved by the Ordinary of the place for hearing the confessions of the nuns, with all necessary facilities granted and appointed.

From which it follows, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as regards ordinary election, but not extraordinary election; if therefore a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary election. If moreover the Bishop neglects to give extraordinary permission, nothing else shall be conceded to the nuns than that they revert to the penitentiary. In the same Bull it is established that if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be accepted from an ordinary election, not from an extraordinary one. For if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be accepted from an ordinary election, not from an extraordinary one. Moniales, licet non sint obligatae extraordinario confessu, tamen sunt obligatae stare ei ut audiat sanctorum admonita. Item, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

Bishops let the same be observed by the Conservators. Item, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; in articulo mortis cuilibet Moniali postulanti concedatur ab Episcopo Confessarius particulares: et si Monasterium sit expemptum, non concedente Prælato regulari, assignetur ab Episcopo, vel recusante praesumptum Episcopo a Pœnitentiario majori, si tempus suppetat. Item, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliqua Monialis renuat confiteri Confessario ordinario, deputetur ei alius ab Episcopo pro certis vicibus, et si Monasterium sit exemptum à Prælato regulari: et ipsa recusante, concedatur ab Episcopo vel Pœnitentiario majori. The Pontiff exhorts the Bishops that they be not difficult in granting an extraordinary Confessor to particular Monials who at some time petition for it.

It has been decreed, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Regular superiors of monasteries shall be bound to assign twice or thrice in a year an extraordinary confessor approved by the bishop for the confessions of nuns; who, at least once in a year, may either be secular, or from another Order, otherwise the bishop shall appoint him; and at that time neither the abbot nor novices shall hear confessions. Moreover, regarding the confessors of the nuns, here five hundred seventy-seven points are to be noted. Nota si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Omnes Confessarii Monialium indigeant speciali electione et approbatione Episcopi loci ex Decretis S. C. apud de Alexand.

QUESTION 1 If however nuns are exempted, confessors for them are presented by their own [authorities], but the same are approved by the

Bishop on a presumed basis from the Constitutions. Gre-48 Lib. VI

Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. gor. Fifteen.

Inscrutable is it, which he confirmed, Bened. XIII. In the pastoral bull of the year 1726 on the day 27th of March. And this assumption is considered in the Confession of venial sins only, as decreed by the Sacred Congregation in the aforementioned place. Questio 2.

Not. 2: Si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Minnen Sisters, after the expiration of three years, shall be declared suspended from hearing their own Confessions, unless they obtain permission from the Holy See, according to multiple Declarations. S. C. apud de. Questio 3.

And this is presumed for confessors and conservators, from another decree in that place. He nevertheless thinks probably that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. It is adverted as presumed in paragraph 4 at the end: if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Episcopi in aliquibus locis, ratione deficientiae Confessa- riorum idoneorum, sinant ipsos durare ultra trien- nium.

The same is noted in Note 3: if a Confessor is elected for the purpose of supplementing, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as regards ordinary election but not extraordinary, should not hinder this. Therefore, if a Confessor is elected for the purpose of supplementing, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as regards ordinary election but not

extraordinary, should not hinder this. Moreover, Monialium Vicarii Generales, Parochi, if their care notably languished, are prohibited from being elected as Confessors, all Regulars, excepting perhaps some Decrees. The Sacred Congregation [S. C.] at the aforementioned point [de 6]. Item Canones Paenitentiariorum, ex aliis declar. S. C. Council.

But to be able to choose them if the Bishop should judge otherwise, he feels is said by the 7th. It must be noted that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with respect to ordinary election, not extraordinary, which, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with respect to ordinary election, not extraordinary, according to the Decree. S. C. apud 8. praecepit ut confessionalia monialium amoveantur a sacristia vel aliis occultis locis et collocentur in exterioribus ecclesiæ. However, it is permissible to hear confessions in another place out of necessity, provided that the appearance of the confessor and the monk be avoided, as noted there under Notandum 5 regarding the stipend of the confessor not being able to be taken from Chapter II.

Doubt. IV. Of the ministerial habit C, according to de . g. But he himself says, this ought not to be held as commonly used.

And Diana and Scortia say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such from ordinary election, not extraordinary, since if a Confessor serves with much patience and constancy, the Abbess can give him something more than the taxed stipend. Note this lastly, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; that is to say, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. The chaplains of armies cannot absolve soldiers sick in garrisons without the faculty of the Apostolic See, or license of the Ordinary, as is declared from many authorities. S. C. which concerns P. Zacharia according to

Croix lib. 6 p. 2 ad n. 1518. ## DUBIUM IV.

What is the nature of the reservation of cases, and who has the power to make such a reservation and grant absolution from them? 578 What is the reservation. 579 Qu. I. Is the reservation made without a cause licit and valid? II.

Whether those ignorant of the reservation of plenary indulgences be excused from it. 581 Doubt. I. Let the reserved cases be excused by the ignorant bishops? Dub. 2.

What, if in cases of Episcopal discretion there is appended excommunication? 582 Dub. 1. Can venial sins be reserved? Doubt 2. Does an internal sin merit?

Dub. 3. What if a sin has been external light and internal serious? Can Regulars reserve cases; and which ones? Is it not the case that those who are defiled by sin and are related [or familiar] might be exempt from reserved cases? See what Busemb. says about this. When can a simple confessor absolve from reserved cases? Dub. 1.

Is it possible to absolve directly if a permanent impediment is present? Dub. 2. If then you are fasting and no one confesses, that no one may communicate? Remissive a. n. 265.

What. I. Dub. 3. Then there must be manifested what is presumed when it is not reserved.

Remissive to that. No. 265. What. II. 586 What if the Superior denies the faculty of absolution? 587 By whom can pilgrims be absolved? 588 Doubt 1. What, if a sin is reserved only in the place of Confession? Q.E.D.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. 589 Dub. 2.

What, if it is reserved only in the Fatherland? And what if someone withdraws from the homeland with fraudulent intent? And how is it to be understood to "in fraudem"? 590 Doubt 3. Can a peregrine be absolved from a reserved censure in his homeland? 591 Dub. 4.

Does one who sins in a foreign Diocese, where the case has been reserved, incur reservation? And whether an exile can be absolved from a reserved excommunication? 592 Dub. 5. Whether one who sins in an exempt monastery, or in another diocese, can be absolved at home by a simple

confessor? 593 Dub. 6. Can bishops absolve foreigners from secret papal censures and grant dispensations to them regarding irregularities?

Doctores 6. An Vicarii Capitulares et alii Praelates habentes jurisdictionem quasi episcopalem habeant eamdem facultatem? Note. 1. Can bishops be permitted to reserve outside of the Sacrament? Not. 2.

What if the Bishop falls into a reserved crime? Not. 3. When is it understood that a crime is hidden? Moreover, whether a Bishop can dispense with vows for strangers?

And in irregularities etc. with impediments? Remissible. Dubium 594. 7. Is a faculty in capitulum Liceat such that it may be used only for cases reserved beforehand by the Council? Dub. 8.

Can Bishops be permitted to absolve from those reserved by other Bishops? Dub. 9. Can bishops generally commit this faculty? Can they be able to absolve from the cases of the Bull of Cæna?

Release. 595 Whether a Superior can sometimes absolve from reserved cases and send the penitent to a lower authority? 596 Whether one who has the power to absolve can receive absolution from anyone regarding reserved cases? Yes. I. An, si paenitens confiteatur bond fide, vel obliviscatur reservati, validè et licité absolutur a simplici Confessario? 597 Qu.

II. May one confessed to a Superior and forgotten the reservation be absolved by anyone? 598 Qu. III. Can a reservation be lifted through confession when the confession is culpably invalidated?

Qu. IV. What if the confession has been sacrilegious? Who can absolve from reserved cases? By the Penitentiary?

May the Mendicants absolve from cases reserved by Bishops, or reserved by Bishops for others to absolve? I. Whether, in a doubt, a penitent who incurs a reserved case can be absolved by anyone? Which.

II. What if later the penitent should come to know the sin as certain? 601 What if? III. Whoever has sinned in the association of license?

What. Chap. II. Dub. Fourth.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 51 IV. May a license suffice for

presumed sins after those committed previously? 602 Qu. V. Do nuns incur a reservation made by the Bishop?

What. VI. An adjacent Nuns exempted? What?

VII. Whether an episcopal office with regard to enclosure can reserve cases of nuns? Resp. 1. This reservation is a negation: of jurisdiction over some sin.

It is certain in the Church that there are certain sins: to be reserved, by whom inferior confessors cannot absolve, so that thus subjects may be more wisely directed and restrained from sins whose remission appears difficult: unless grave causes are present, no one, nor who can, should easily reserve anything or harden grace in granting absolution from those reserved, lest otherwise he yield to destruction; if a confessor is chosen for supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years is as odious and strict when concerning regular election as extraordinary. But although any Ordinarius has the power to reserve, nevertheless custom in Parishes has abolished this practice. Herein is warned the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council according to Fagnan in cap. Cum olim de Pre- script. n. 24: namely, if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if some Confessor should be chosen for supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, so odious and strict, is held concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Bishops having jurisdiction quasi episcopal, can well reserve cases. Hic quaeritur I.

Whether a reservation made without rightful cause is valid? Commonly they affirm that it is gravely sinful for Superiors to reserve cases without a reasonable cause. See whether they reserve invalidly? They affirm, P. Soto.

Ledesma, Henr., etc., according to Escob. I, 16n. 47o, because from the Council, sess. 14, cap. 7. It has been given to bishops a cause for preceding evil, for edification (as it is said there), and not for destruction. They deny rather more commonly and accurately. 5.tr. 6 c. 12 n. 5 . n. 6 go. Suar, p. 2 d., 3g sect. 4 n. 8.

Lugo on the 20th, number 36. Close of Cas. res. 'd., 1 n. 13 et Escob. n. 472 cum Sylv. Fag, etc. Reason, because all judicial power emanates from the Bishop, who might reasonably reserve to his confessors, who are assumed parishes, the presumed power of absolving some case; but in every doubt regarding this matter, see the 5th Book, chapter 1, note 13 and Escobar's note 472 with Sylv.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. standing as regards the power of the Superior who possesses it.

They indeed limit Lugo 12.37 and Ciera n. 14 regarding the confessors, if such a reservation exists that morally they would not be able to exercise their office, then however that reservation would only be null, which is posterior and excessive. Quære II. An: ignorant ones. By reason of the reservation of some case, may they be excused from it? This must be distinguished between cases reserved by the Pope, and those reserved by the Bishop. If the case is papal, it commonly stands between the Doctors. (contraItà . p. d. 29 sect. 2 n. 8.

Sauce. To God. 1. 2 c. 8 n. 3 et c. 11 n. 1 et de Matr. 1. 9 d. 32 n. 18. d: 92. . tr. 14 n. 58. Closed day 1 number 29. Croix 1: 6 p. 2 n. 1614 cum Aversa et Stoz., res. 1: 5 c. 5 n. 7.

Abelly p. 144 n. 2: Diana p. 5 trans. 9. R. 17. Pal de Poen. p. 155: 2nd note 1 with a. 18 from Vidal, Moya, Caj. Durant: etc., et putant probabilem Lugo d. 20 num. 11 et 455 cum Bon. 7 in. 43 ulqué patet ex cap. 2 'de Constit. in. 6 'ubi dicitur: Ut animarum periculis obvietur, sententias per statuta quorumcumque Ordinariorum prelatis ligari nolumus ignorantes, dummodo lamen eorum ignorantia crassa non fuerit, aut supina. And although in cases pertaining to the Papal office, the reservation is made not only of censure but also of presumed sin, as the true authorities teach . n. 5 and Suar l. c. n. 8 with D. Thomas, Palud.

Gabr. Major. et., which, if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, does not seem probable; however, because in cases reserved by the Pope the censure is immediately reserved (as it is stated in the Bull with the penalty of excommunication - Cap. II. Dub. IV. Of the minister of this sacrament: This has been reserved to us), and a medium sin, if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as

it is odious, strict, and to be received as such from ordinary election and not from extraordinary, is a censure tied. Therefore, since sin is indivisible from censure, reserved censure, a presumed sin remains reserved; but on the contrary, since censure is the medium by which sin is reserved, when this medium, namely censure, is removed, there remains no longer a reserved sin.

Si autem aliquis sciebat censuram, ignorantem esse reservatam, Bon. et alii apud Mazotta l. c. excusant eum a reservatione; sed melius dictu Mazzotta secundum Quarti non excusari, quia ille iam consentit in poenam censurae, adeoque implicita in ejus reservationem et in omnes alios effectus eiusdem, licet ignoratos. We have said that if a Confessor is chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election but not extraordinary, is a censure-bound penalty; therefore, because sin is indivisible from censure, reserved censure, presumptive sin remains reserved; on the contrary, since censure is the medium whereby sin is reserved, removed by that medium, namely censure, no reserved sin remains. Cases Papal, if possible, will be reserved with censure, but two cases are to be excepted which are reserved without censure to the Pontiff. Case I is this: si quis falso accusat Sacerdotem innoxium de sollicitatione apud Judices ecclesiasticos, sive per seipsum, sive procurando ut per alios calumnia inferatur; ita ex Constitutionibus. Bened. XIV. quae incipit Sacramentum.

Case 2 is (as the Ancoratus reports in its work entitled: Instru- sione per li Novelli Confessori p. 2 c. 15 n. 306) if anyone receives gifts from Regulars of either sex, unless first he has entirely restored them; and whether the gifts are worth more than ten Roman shields or less, at least part thereof remains at the discretion of the Penitentiary. Whether however one would be excused from these two cases by ignorance, see what will be said below regarding the following. Moreover, Sanchius includes the case of a promotion to or from Orders through the simony of Matr. n. 18 and Conich. d. 8 n. 82; is promoted or promoting oneself by means of such an act. V. Regarding this case, however, speaking of it, one should say that it is not to be incurred through ignorance, because this reservation was imposed solely for the punishment of the delinquents; but rather more appropriately, as Palao says in loc., not to incur it, because doubt exists thereupon.

Ignorantes invincibiliter reservationem excusentur a non incurri casibus praesumptis ab Episcopis reservatis? There are three opinions. The first universally affirms, and this is held by Cierad. i. n. 3, item 54, lib. VI.

Treatise.

IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance: Marsh. Graph. Quintanad., etc., in 18th chapter, number 4, note 13; likewise Reg. Malad.

Bass. p. 455. v. Third, and probable, he considers Lugo, D. 20, n. 11. The reason, as they say, is that reservation has a proportion of penalty from which ignorance excuses. They also consider this judgment probable, namely Salm, d. c. 4 n. 13 and Gobat. tr. 7 nu. 306 and Sporer num. 735 with others, saying that one can absolve an ignorant person for the first time without fault. But they employ a different reason: for they confess that reservation is not a mere penalty, but say that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this has reason: of medicinal penalty, so that men may be restrained from more atrocious sins by fear; yet they cannot be restrained from sinning through reservation, who are ignorant thereof; wherefore, when the adequate end of reservation ceases in the ignorant, the pretended reservation ceases.

The second opinion, which differs little from the first, and which is held by Joseph de Janeiro de Casib. Reservationem. Res. 1 et probabilem putant. C. et Diana p. 10 tr. 14. R. 63 cum Graff. et; secundum vero si facta ferit per legem generalem, aut Statutum Synodale, prout sunt casus reservati, qui annotantur in Tabella. Reason, because in a reserved case the reservation has the reason of medicine, and directly regards confessors; but in the second case, when the reservation is made in the statute, it has the reason of punishment, and directly regards penitents.

The third opinion, however, which is more common and to which I subscribe, altogether denies that it is possible to absolve those who are ignorant of the reservation, and they hold this: L. 9 d. 32 n. 18. 2 d. 1 p. 19 n. 8. Wigandt translated 14 n. 58. Reservation chapter 1 note 2. Antoine page 527 question 1. Concina p. 563 ex n. 2. . 9 a. 3 n. 2 et Croix n. 1608 cum aliis communissime. Reason, because reservation is not indeed a punishment looking to penitents, but a restriction of jurisdiction looking to confessors; and it seems that this should be doubted; for in the Tridentine Session 14, Chapter 7, to show that if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can appropriately be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary, if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can appropriately be confirmed by another triennium

after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Priests can do nothing in Cap. II. Dub. IV. Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament: as it is reserved for five and fifty cases (as it is declared at the end thereof), these words precede: I ought not to give absolution to anyone whom the Priest ordains or subdelegates (note) in whom he does not have ordinary jurisdiction. Very much does it however pertain to the discipline of the Christian people that this be so.

It seemed fitting to our fathers that certain more atrocious crimes not be remitted by any, but only by the highest priests. Therefore priests can have no authority over reserved cases, because they lack jurisdiction over them, since bishops reserve the judgment of certain more serious crimes for the sake of public good. Therefore, Father, if a penitentiary confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary; the reservation directly regards confessors, not penitents. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor is elected for supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in ordinary elections, but not in extraordinary ones, shows directly that the reservation primarily regards penitents, since the reservation was instituted solely for the remedy of penitents to withdraw at least from more atrocious sins: whence, ceasing the adequate reason for the reservation, the presumptuous reservation also ceases. Nam responditur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. finis reservationis non sit tantùm, ut fideles à culpis gravioribus absterreantur, sed praesumptum (proùt rectè dict cum aliis) ut recipiant à Superioribus poenitentias, et mo- nita, ac remedia opportuniora, quæ nonnisi à pru- dentioribus applicari expedit; ergò, cum in ignoran- tibus non cesset adæquatè finis reservationis, reser- vatio non cessat.

Doubt is cast. The ignorant are freed from the reserved case by the Bishop,

if the case is attached to a common communication? It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be confirmed for another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be interpreted so as to excuse ignorance from excommunication; whether then it will excuse presumptuous reservation of a case is doubtful. The first opinion affirms this, and Wigandt holds thus according to tr. 14 n. 58. Ciera d. r n. 3r et v.

Secondo. Reason, because when to a particular case an indelible reservation is made through excommunication; hence he who does not incur excommunication, neither incurs presumptively the reservation of a presumed sin. The second more probable opinion denies, and this opinion they hold, Res Lib. VI. Treatise.

Fourth. Of the Sacrament of Penance, ch. 5, note 7, section 2, n. i i. Laic 1. i tr. 5 p. 2 c. 6 n. 10. Cross 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1614 with Stoh, and Mazzotta 1. c. with Mèrrol. Bossio, and others.

Reason, because in this they differ the cases of Popes from those of Bishops; for in the cases of Popes (as we have said) principally and indivisibly is reserved the censure; but in the cases of Bishops mainly and per se is reserved the case, to which is annexed the censure; so that sinners may be bound more strongly thereby, and by double reservation restrained from sinning; and hence in the Table of reserved cases for Bishops they are thus annotated: Cases reserved, to which excommunication is annexed. When there is no obligation to confess venial sins, they are frivolously reserved, although perhaps they might be remitted by the Pope; hence only mortal sins, and those that are gravely external and completed works, are prudently reserved. Hence, incest or sodomy extravagium are not reserved to the Pope; see Mazzotta tom. 3 pag. 592 num. 9 and pag. 549. Insuper peccata reservata debent esse perfecta in sua specie: unde sodomia imperfecta, v.g. maris cum feminâ, non intelligitur reservata, ut Tournely tom. 3 pag. 501 vers. Even so, since Thomas in II 2 q. 154 art. 1 where access to an undue sex is required for sodomy), whether or not venial sins can be reserved is doubted? * 52a Here it is doubted whether or not venial sins can be reserved? He denies—but commonly affirms—Ciera n. 63 and Croix l.c., with Dic. et Aversa, Ratio, namely, although there is no obligation to confess venial sins, nevertheless they cannot be remitted by the Sacrament of Penance except by the authority dependent on the Church, which can duly negate or limit them.

It is doubted whether mere internal sins can be reserved? It seems that this

should be denied, since internal sins, even if they are potentially concealed, are not subject to the judgment of the Church, which does not judge concerning the hidden matters. But commonly and rightly they affirm: 342: 9 a. 2 nu. 1. Beginning Chapter II. Doubt.

IV. Regarding the Minister of this Sacrament. Page 5, paragraph 527, question 1 and Croix note number 1605: When the Church reserves internal sins, it does not judge regarding them, but rather concerning their absolution; which is an external act. Tamburr however mentions, De Casibus reser. 1, 5, c. 4, n. 12. The Church has never been accustomed to reserving such internal sins. Doubt is cast 3.

Does a sin externally light in nature fall under reservation if it is internally grave? Turrianus affirms in D. 3i dub. 7i. But others more truly and commonly deny this, as Lugo in d. 20 n. 15. . 4 de Relig. l. 2 c. 18 num. 12, and Ciera in D. 1 n. 60 with others. Reason, because although the external act imbues the whole malice of the internal act and merits eternal punishment entirely, yet with regard to reservation there is a difference in reason, because Superiors do not intend to reserve sins unless they are gravely externally consummated, since they do not usually reserve internal ones. Therefore, Clement VIII decreed that Bishops, if they wish, can reserve up to eleven cases alone, but no more without the consent of the General Chapter for the whole Order, or a Provincial Chapter for their Province. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning non-selection of a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be understood in terms of ordinary election rather than extraordinary, should be interpreted thus; for a prelate can command something under an excommunication reserved to himself. *(But commonly and probablistically they deny that the prelates can impose censures upon any particular case; this Lugo d. 20 n. 47.*

Sanch l. 6 c. 1 n. 15 et Et de hoc Cont. Tourney l. 6 p. 2 p. 125. profert Decretum S. C. Episc. sub 7 Juli 1717.) Casus autem Clementis sunt sequentes: 1. Apostasy from Religion, with a presumed retained habit. 2. Night-time, and a clandestine exit from the monastery. 3.

Veneficia, incantationes, et sortilegia. 4. Property in opposition to » the vow of poverty, which is a mortal sin. 58 Lib. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. 5. A mortal theft from the goods of the monastery. 6. Lapse of voluntary carnal work completed. 7. Oath » then false in a legitimate judgment. 8.

Procuration » counsel or assistance toward a deliberate abortive act upon an animate fetus » presumed effect not followed through. 9. Occision, vel vulneratio, seu gravis percussio cujuscumque personae. » 10 Falsification of hand, or seal of officials concerning abortion. 11. Malicious impediment, delay, or opening of letters from Superiors to inferiors, or contrariwise. Here to be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be interpreted thus. For if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be interpreted thus.

Religious exempted are not subject to the reservation of the Bishop, nor to the Novitiate: Matt. 3 p. 458 q. 5. Neither their own relatives, as is held in the Bull of Clement VIII. Superne, modo (ut ibi dicitur) inibi sint quasi de familia, et continuos commensuales. He extended it, Bordon, to the students of monasteries. If however a novice falls into a reserved case before his entry, he certainly cannot be absolved by any secular confessor, but can by a religious confessor, on account of the privilege granted to the religion; Mazzotta I. c. with Sanchez, .. §4 "He who confesses what is reserved must be sent to the superior"; (charity will nevertheless recommend that he remain silent and perhaps seek permission from the superior to absolve him in case of necessity.) * (Ordinarily speaking, it has been decreed that a confessor should not undertake such an obligation, so as not to.* If a confessarius is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium following the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessarius beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the superior cannot be reached, and there is urgent cause, for instance, fear of infamy or scandal due to the omission of confession or communion, then he can absolve from reserved penances when the penitent subsequently states his case before the superior.* (See de Censur. lib. 7 n. 91.) If a confessarius is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium following the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessarius beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary.* It has been presumed truly that which bears an attached reserved censure. * (Or rather this is certain from the Decretum De Catero, and the chapter Eo noscitur, de Sentences excom.)

See lib. 7 n. 86.) * Nevertheless in that case confessing even non-reserved sins proved sufficiently probable for Sotus, Corduba, and Gabr. Anton. Taken. II. Doubt.

IV. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 59 Palaus, 104, and Lugo d, 14 de Euchar. n. 86 non improbat: S. Th., et alii commun. docent omnia esse confitenda, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. tutius est. » Quando igitur adest impedimentum, et urget gravis causa confitendi, quivis Confessarius potest indirectè absolvere à casibus reservatis ab Episcopo (et praesumptive à reservatis à Papa, si Episcopos non possit adiri, ut diximus n. 563 dub II.) Ità communiter . 31 sect. 3 n. 3. Wigandt. tr. 14 n. 76. . 9 art. 2 n. 9. Bonaventura pars quintae sectionis tertii numerus quinto et Ciera n. 74. etc., et hoc etiamsi peccatum sit reservatum cum excommunicatione, ut dicunt. 31 sectio secunda. 75.

Ciera l.c. cum Lugo, et (contra Qu.) III. We said that if there is a serious reason, namely, if it cannot be referred to a Superior without scandal or note of infamy (as the Councils and Wigaudt say, laym:, or without much difficulty; suppose he has the ability to remain far away (as they also say from another part urge necessity of communicating, or disobeying the precept of annual Confession, or lest the penitent remain for a long time in mortal sin); as is commonly said by all the aforementioned Authorities. We said 2. indirectly, from which (according to the more probable opinion, adapted [or allated] no. 265. What.

I. is bound to the penitent who, having no faculty in a reserved sacramentary confessor, confesses other mortal sins not reserved, so that they may be directly absolved from these, and indirectly from those reserved; and after this, when the impediment ceases, the one with faculty in a reserved sacramentary confessor is bound to confess, according to what is said in the sequel and of Et sic pariter, if he does not have another mortal sin not reserved and doubts about contrition, under an urgent precept of confession, is bound to confess at least some venial sin, or another mortal sin already confessed. See what is said in n. 265. There is doubt. If an impediment to going to Super-60 exists, lib. VI.

Tract. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. If the penitent is perpetual, then may the inferior directly absolve from reserved sin without censure, so that the penitent may be released in the future from going to a Superior if later the impediment ceases? They affirm that in lib. 2 c. 13 n. 50: and because (as they say) no law prohibits the burden of being present before the Superior for sins without censure reserved, which they suppose to be directly remitted in that case. But more correctly they teach: 30 sect. 3 n. 8 et cum communis, si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per alium triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Extra articulum mortis nullius inferior Sacerdos possit directe absolvere à reservatis: extra quem articulum (dict) Sacerdotes nihil posse in casibus reservatis.

This however proceeds in cases Episcopal; for according to the rule of law of the Pontiff (as he well says), if a Confessor be chosen as supplementary, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, when there is no access to the Pontiff, the penitent may be directly absolved by the Bishop, or with a presumptively hindered impediment to approach the Bishop, from any Confessor, bearing the obligation subsequently to present oneself before the Pontiff whenever possible, if the impediment is not permanent; for if it is permanent, he is altogether released, according to what is said in lib. 7 num. 88. Concerning the absolution of these papal cases for those who are prevented from approaching the Pontiff, see other texts in the Decretals, book 7, article 84. There is a doubt whether one who has a reserved sin, if there be lacking a confessor with the power, is bound to confess to a lower authority urgently necessitated by the need to communicate? Though the negative opinion is not improbable, yet the affirmative one is more common and more probable, because Confession should precede Communion, at least a formal and integral one, when material confession is impossible. See what is said at n. 265.

What. I. There is doubt 3. Whether this kind of penitent, willing to confess a sin of lesser gravity, is then bound to make known both reserved and non-reserved mortal sins at that time? See there.

Question. II. where we said that it is probable for the negative opinion to be valid unless the manifestation of reserves is necessary so that the confessor can judge rightly regarding dispositions. Cap. II. Doubt. IV. Of the Minister of this Sacrament.

If by penitential disposition and provide suitable remedies. Wherefore, if the Confessor questions, he is entirely bound to manifest the presumed penitent's reserved matters; for (as well says Lugo d. 16 n. 123.) a penitent in himself has no necessity of manifesting any [matters], but yet it is necessary that he disclose them if questioned by the Confessor, who has the right to know the state of his conscience, both as judge so as rightly to judge of his disposition, and also as physician so as to apply salutary remedies. And this seems to harmonize with it, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in the case of ordinary election that it should not be interpreted as strictly in the case of extraordinary election. This teaches D. Thomas Suppl. 3. p. q. 9. art. 2.ad 4., where he says: Although a priest cannot absolve everyone, nevertheless the penitent is bound to confess all to him so that (note) he may know the quantity of his entire guilt. « 3. If the Superior unjustly denies the faculty of absolution to one reserved, permitting him instead to be directly absolved by another Confessor, they affirm. Resol. 29 esse probabile.

But more correctly they deny, Laym: "lib. 3 tract. 9 cap. 13 Card. de Lugo d. 29 n. 233: '(And this I hold to be in common with what is preserved by Lugo d. 20 n. 148.' Salm: » cap. 13 n. 62. et Ciera d. 1 n. 126. cum ; » tum quia, congruent validam est injusta reservatio, ita etiam injusta denegatio facultatis. » 4. Superiors sin if they offer themselves reluctantly in granting licenses for the absolution of reserved cases without just cause. Moreover, if from the denial serious harm is feared to the subjects, then I have sinned against charity and justice. Lugo, Diana page 6 title 6 reason 56. Wherefore he says Cierada D: 1 n. 109, cum.

Thomas, superiorem regulariter non debeo esse difficilem in conce-denda faculitate; ac proinde peccare, si eam neget, casu quo scilicet potentem nullo modo posse inducit ad ipsum alueundum). If the Superior Confessor of Regulars appointed to this negates the faculty of absolving, I should judge it ought to be conceded that he can absolve in this behalf. Sect. 20. Referencing chapter four, Clement VIII is said to have thus declared and is recorded in the fourth volume of Bullarii, Bulla 26 of Urban VIII. >(It is commonly presumed that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, his confirmation may well be completed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood to apply to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones; for if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, his confirmation may well be

completed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood to apply to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. Thus, for this reason, it is understood whenever there is an intervening, and concerning which the Concilium has spoken.) Turnley to. 6 p. 2 pag.

"125 produces the Decree of the Sacred Congregation on the consent of the City." VII.* » and 11 saying, "there is no doubt" about this matter: he also added from seven other probable sources that it could be so, if a religious man, pious, learned, and prudent, although not one designated in fact, should deny it. Dian p. 3 t. 3 res. 126 par. 6 to. 6 rez. 56 et par. 9 tom. 3 R. 15 ex Pellizario (qui vult idem esse, si poenitens ipse petat) et aliis. But if it cannot be absent without note, since all others communicate. Ibid ex . Finally, chapter 26 of the second response notes from tome four, book two, chapter fifteen.

Regulars » may be absolved once without the license of their Superiors from reservations, such as those who still and henceforth possess this privilege in common with FF. » Minors, whose identity is attested by Emmanuel » . 1 qq. » 6. Nevertheless, it is certain that at times a superior can deny the subordinate the faculty to appeal just causes, and compel him to come to himself. Sufficient notice must be had of this in order to avoid it; otherwise one is not sufficiently secure nor disposed for absolution. Wherefore if the Confessor in such a case press for absolution, he ought to attend to it, so that the penitent fulfill the obligation without recourse to the common remedy of evil or harm, if there be such. Doubt.

IV. Of this Minister of the Sacrament. - 65 Because a peril, inasmuch as if he does not do this, he cannot be absolved; not on account of a lack of jurisdiction, but because he is not disposed. For this reason, however, it is required that the obligation of the penitent be certain, and that other remedies cannot be employed. 4 de Relig. 1. 8 c. 5 a. 10. 7. Peregrinus, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. reservationem judicandus 58; est juxta diocesim, in qua versatur: in qua quae reservata sint, discant Pastores ex Agendis, aut con- suetudine.

» It is therefore questioned whether a peregrin departing to another diocese can be absolved there from reserved cases? If a penance is reserved in both dioceses, commonly held by all, such cannot be remitted by any confessor; thus commonly. 30 a. i n. 6. Lugo D. 20 n. 69. Good. D. 5 q. 7

par. 5 § 2 n. 9. and others similarly throughout.

But they say that one can absolutely absolve from Confession who has the faculty in the reserved, citing and P. Milante in proposition 12 condemned. Alexander. VII. page 102 and section 9 article 3 note 5 at the end, because it is more common, as (it says that. But there is doubt i. Whether a simple pilgrim penitent can be absolved by any confessor if another is chosen for the supplement, it may well be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in the case of ordinary and not extraordinary election, which is reserved in that diocese but not in the homeland?

The first proposition affirms what Sotus holds in article 4, note 4. Certainly, here is the literal English translation of the target sentence: Equidem, (qui probabilem putat) et alii ap. . 30 sect. i n. 6. Reason, because a stranger ought to be judged according to the laws of his Superior, whose tacit consent the Confessor of that place absolves him.

The second opinion, however, denies this, and those who hold this view are found in c. Lugo D. 20 n. 72. Book on Doctrine Part 5 §:2 note 11. Concina page 570 note 4. Wigandt tract. 14 n. 58. Ciera D. i n. 61. And because both in principle and for this reason a pilgrim should conform himself to the laws of the place in which he is, he submits his sacramental judgment; and because such a penitent feels sorrow sufficient for contrition, so that he may be heard by any confessor.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. Of the Sacrament of Penance: It should feel inconvenience to be absolved from reserved sins only in its own homeland, as we shall say in the following doubt, so it ought to suffer discomfort that it cannot absolve from reserved sins in the place of Confession. And thus the Sacred Congregation of Bishops resolves in No. 620, Chapter 17.

This sentence is indeed more common and much more probable because, given the current custom (as will be said shortly), namely that if a Confessor is chosen as an addition, it can easily be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict as it is for ordinary elections rather than extraordinary ones. Therefore, if a Confessor is chosen as an addition, he can be everywhere absolved by any approved Confessor; today they are no longer absolved at the will of their Bishops, but at the will of the Church which grants such a custom permission, so that those confessing may be considered inhabitants of the place. But since the reservation (as we have approved n. 581) regards

Confessors and not penitents, the Confessor of the locality is not able to absolve them from sin in which his jurisdiction is limited by his Ordinarian. Dubitatur 2. Can a foreigner, who has been lured into sin, be absolved, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, and it can be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when applied to ordinary election, but not extraordinary?, this being so, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when applied to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. is it reserved only in his homeland? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by the authors on the matter. Confess. apud Croix lib. i cap. i art. 2 Question 18 item Vega, et Solo, Fag. cap. 13 n. 22.

Reason why, because when a pilgrim is released by license of his Bishop, it does not seem credible if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, that he might be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, which, if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, might be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Bishop, who reserves a case within his diocese, shall not reserve a presumed one outside. The second commoner and more veracious opinion holds to this, as affirmed by Lugo D. 20 n. 71. . 20 sect. i n. 4., with Cajet S. Antonin. et Palud. Concina page 570 note 4. 106 question 1 R 2 Mazzotta volume 3 page 479. Croix n. 1631.

Cabassut. lib. 3 cap. 12 n. 1. with c. 13 n. 24 with Praepos. Gabr. This custom has been approved by the consensus of the Bishops, and especially by Pope Eugene IV who (as reported in Lugo and cc.) approved it, that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary elections and not extraordinary ones. For this reason, if a Confessor is chosen for the purpose of supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary elections and not

extraordinary ones. Dub. IV.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 65 revolving around it, let those who inhabit that place conduct themselves in order congruent with Confession. Extremely reasonable is such a custom; otherwise confessors would hardly be able to absolve any pilgrim, since it often happens that if someone is chosen as a substitute confessor, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period following the time of substitution, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period should be understood with odious strictness regarding regular elections, but not extraordinary ones. Thus, neither penitents nor confessors would know about reserved cases in another diocese. This is confirmed by the Bull, Superna, Clemente. X edita 21 Junii 1670 (relata in extensum apud Croix lib. 7 p. 2n. 1502.) in qua sic dicitur: Posse autem regularem Confessarium in Diocesi, in qua est approbatus, confuentes ex alia Diocesi et peccatis in ipsa reservatis, non autem in illa, ubi idem Confessor est approbatus, absolvere; nisi eosdem paenitentes nocerit in fraudem reservationis ad alienam Diocesin in obtendenda absolutione migrasse. Which limitation holds not only for regular confessors: but is presumed (nay, all the more so) for secular ones as rightly Croix says n: 1631. . 9 n. 3. art. 4 and Roncaglia page 106 qu. 1 R. 2 from the Declaration of S. C. as found in Dianam.

How however that is to be understood in fraud of reservation, the DD. greatly disagree. P. Concina p. 570 n. 4 dict intelligi si non fiat bona fide; et in hoc vere conveniunt omnes, sed sic non explicatur ubi consistat fraudus, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. est punctum difficultatis. Others, however, as P. Mazzotta to. 3 pag. 470 in fine; but this explanation does not seem fitting, since the Pontiff speaks of external forum, and not of sacramental forum. Others, as P. Milante in proposition 12 condemned by Alexander. VII page 102 (to which Wigandt, tractate 14 n. 60, agrees) thus explains: "For then one is said to have migrated in fraud of reservation when he has sinned with confidence in obtaining absolution, where the reserved sin was not present."

If however, after committing a crime in order more easily to obtain absolution, he turns elsewhere, it is not considered to operate by fraud, because no hindrance intervenes through deceit, but for the sake of greater facilitation according to his Dice. 5 6i Lib. VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. It should feel an impediment to be absolved from reserved sins only in its own homeland, as we will say in the following

doubtful case, so it must understand this inconvenience that it cannot absolve from reserved sins in place of Confession.

And thus S. C. Episc. resolves it 17 n. 620. This judgment is indeed more common and much more probable, because travelers, according to today's custom (as will be said shortly below); namely, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, must be received accordingly. Wherefore, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, must be received accordingly. Everywhere they will be absolved by any Confessor approved, today not more are absolved according to their Bishops' will, but according to the will of the Church which, having approved such a custom, grants them such faculty as if they were residents in the place where penitents confess: since the reservation (as we have approved n. 581) regards Confessors and not penitents, hence a Confessor of the place must not absolve them from sin in which his jurisdiction is limited by his Ordinario. Dubitatur 2. Whether a peregrine, who has been entangled in sin, can be absolved if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, and it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years being odious and strict is understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, that is to say, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, is only reserved for his homeland? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by authors on the matter.

Confess. apud Croix lib. 1 cap. 1 art. 2 Question 18 item Vega, et Solo, Fag. cap. 13 n. 22. Reason why: When a stranger is released by the license of his Bishop, it does not seem credible that if a Confessor were chosen as a supplement, he might be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; for if a Confessor were chosen as a supplement, he might be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it

is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Bishop, who reserves a case within his diocese, shall not presumptuously reserve one outside. The second commoner and more reliable opinion affirms this, which the bishops of Lugo uphold according to D. 20 n. 71. . 20 sect. 1 n. 4. with Cajetan St. Anthony and Palud. Concina page 570 note 4. 106 question 1 response 2 Mazzotta volume 3 page 479.

Cross n. 1631. Cabassut. lib. 3 cap. 12 n. 1. cum c. 13 n. 24 cum Praepos. John. This custom has been approved by the consensus of the Bishops, especially by Eugene IV who (as reported in Lugo and elsewhere) approved it, that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Moreover, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Furthermore, who in a foreign Diocese faithfully Chapter II. Doubt.

IV. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 65 turns are made, so that they conduct themselves in order regarding Confession those inhabitants congruent with that place. But very reasonable is such a custom; otherwise confessors would hardly be able to absolve any foreigner, since it often happens that if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, neither penitents nor confessors would know reserved cases in a foreign diocese. This is confirmed by the Bull, Superna, Clemente. X edita 21 Junii 167o (relata in extensum apud Croix lib. 7 p. 2n. 1502.) in qua sic dicitur: Posse autem regularis Confessarii in Dioecesi, in qua est approbatus, confuentes ex alia Dioecesi peccatis in ipsa reservatis, non autem in illa, ubi idem Confessor est approbatus, absolvere; nisi eosdem poenitentes noverit in fraudem reservationis ad alienam Dioecesin pro absolutione obtinenda migrassæ.

The limitation in question holds not only for regular confessors: but is presumed (rather even more so) for seculars, as correctly stated by Croix n: 1631. . 9 n. 3. art. 4 and Roncaglia pag. 106 qu. 1 R. 2 ex Declaratione S. C. apud Dianam. How however that is to be understood in the matter of

fraud against reservation, the DDs [Doctors of the Church] are greatly at variance. P. Concina p. 570 n. 4 dicit intelligi, si non fiat bona fide; et in hoc vere conveniunt omnes, sed sic non explicatur ubi consistat fraudem, si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. hoc est punctum difficultatis. Others however, as P. Mazzotta to. 3 pag. 470 in fine states; but this explanation does not seem fitting, since the Pope is not speaking of external forum, but only of sacramental one. Others, according to P. Milante in proposition 12 condemned by Alexander.

VII. page 102 (with which Wigandt tract. 14 n. 60 agrees) thus explains: "For then one is said to have migrated in fraud of reservation when he has sinned in confidence of obtaining absolution where the reserved sin was not." If, however, after having committed the crime in order more easily to obtain absolution, he diverges to another [confession], it is not deemed to be operated through fraud, because without any intervening deceit, but by reason of a greater convenience does He Himself . 66 Lib. VI. Draw. Fourth.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. it withdraws: no differently than if it approached another Decesim in which the same crime would be reserved, but more penitentiaries would be present to whom it could be absolved. » And thus does Praesumptum Palaus' translation 3 d. 1 p. 24 § 5 n. 4 understand, with Basil of Leon (to whom he adheres). But to this explanation, namely, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; otherwise that which is meant would be to accuse a sin through confidence, and I cannot consent to this, since the Pontiff forbids absolution for those who commit sin in fraud, not because they sin in fraud, but because they migrate to another in fraud. For the Author of the book (Instruz. per li Novel.) and Campione on page 63 n. 18 state that a penitent then migrates in fraud if he departs for the sole end of obtaining absolution elsewhere, without any other reasonable cause. Others, however, more probingly explain "in fraudem" thus: when one seeks an alien Diocese for the principal purpose of obtaining absolution, renewal of the promise of the Crucifix against further sinning and to be avoided, not to turn away from the aspect of the complicitous alone, and similar matters, under the judgment of one's own Pastor. Reason, because fraud is said to intervene when the law becomes deceptive; it would be said that this law of reservation would be eluded if

the penitent were to migrate elsewhere for the primary reason of seeking absolution. Undoubtedly he himself can be absolved, if he has resorted to some Diocese for a legitimate reason, such as the purpose of conducting business, or obtaining Indulgence; or that he may confess with less inconvenience, or more quickly; or that he may find a confessor unknown to him, or wiser, who may better direct him and consult his peace of conscience, and similar reasons.

As we have said, similarly (if he approaches with the principal intent) in order to avoid his Superior's judgment, or in order that he may be more easily absolved. Neither then does this penitent profit thereby, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, who can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received in respect of ordinary election, but not in extraordinary; for he who bona fide believes this to be not prohibited; nevertheless, would migrate into fraud. Cap. II. Doubt. IV. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. Of reservation.

And this said sufficeiunt. pag. 1 q. 1 n. 19. (ubi et Roncag. ibid.) de eo, qui in fraudem reservationis peccatum reservatum in patria extra committeret, ad finem obtinendi ibi postea absolutionem. But I do not adhere to this, because here he would not migrate for the purpose of obtaining absolution fraudulently after being reserved abroad, as stated in Clement's Bull (as above n. 380), but he would migrate elsewhere so as not to incur reservation. There is doubt 3. Whether a penitent outside the Diocese can be granted the third absolution from the censure, which is reserved only in the homeland? They affirm Passer t. 2 q. 187 n. 470. and others.

But rather better they deny it, Wigandt tractatus 14 nota 59 and Ratio, because the whole power of a simple Confessarius to absolve from censures is derived from canon Nuper de acridis, excomm. in 6; there it is said that a simple Confessarius cannot absolve from censures when these are reserved, wherefore in reserved censures the simple Confessarius can do nothing. Doubt is cast 4. Si peregrinus peccando in aliud dicenum, ubi ille casus est reservatus, incurrit reservationem et nequebit ibi absolvi nisi a faculdайте текст на английский язык строго сохраняя академическую, каноническую и моральную терминологию теологии (например, Св. Томас Акинтина, Иона, Пруммер, Синопанди, Аертнйс-Дамен, Скавини). Перевод слово в слово с максимальной точностью. Не упрощайте термины.

Не сокращайте. Не параллелизуйте. Поддерживайте строгое структурное и логическое значение. Если термин двусмыслен,

выбирайте технический-теологический смысл. Сохраняйте логическую структуру и нюансы.

Если термин неоднозначен, выбирайте техно-тегологический смысл. Выходите только с английским переводом, который требуется. The first opinion denies it; and they hold to this because foreigners (as it is asserted by him), when sinning in another diocese where that case is reserved, incur reservation, and cannot be absolved there except by one having the faculty. Nevertheless, the second opinion is more probable and affirms this, which the same Mazz. holds in his first book, chapter one, and in Aversa's question 17 section three. Reason, firstly because although the peregrinus, as we said regarding Legib. lib. x n. 156, is not subject to the laws of the place through which he transits, nevertheless, by reason of the offense, while he sins, he is subjected; furthermore, because, as we said in n. 588, a Confessor who receives reservation cannot absolve peregrinos except according to the limits of his jurisdiction, which he holds from his Ordinary.. 68 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. Therefore this foreigner inquires about a reserved case; yet he does not incur excommunication attached to it, as Couinck more truly states in d. 13 dub. 7 n. 58. . d. 5 sect. 5 n. 8. . tit. c. 1 n. 117. with Sylvester.

Avila, Covar., and Mazzotta in the cited location and volume 4, page 263, et cetera, prove this point from chapter A nobis, 25, on excommunication in 6 where it is stated thus: Subjects alone are comprehended under latae sententiae excommunication by the Bishop for future sins. The reason is that excommunication cannot be inflicted upon subjects and those who are contumacious; but since foreigners, although they are constituted as subjects by reason of sin, yet because before sinning they were not subjects, they cannot be called contumacious. And this is true whether the excommunication has been imposed through a particular sentence, or through a general statute; because aliens do not fall under these censures unless they have contracted domicile, or virtually, in places where such are widespread, as they more reasonably state... (see the aforementioned reference l. 1 n. 156.) For major excommunication) Mazzotta cites, loc. cit., excommunications which are reputed to be inflicted by statute with a view to the common good of the territory, etc. See said statement in book 1 number 156. It is doubted 5.

Si peccans intra diocesin, sed in monasterio exempto secundum numerum 59a, incurret casum reservatum? The first opinion denies this, and this view is held by Baucius and 14 R. 7 who considers it probable. Reason; because (as they say) no reservation is incurred when a sin is committed

where there is no reservation. The second however, opinion which we embrace fully, affirms this, and those maintain it who are d. 5 sect. 4 n. 6. Conc. dub. 13 eod. tit. dub. 7 n. 63. 1 tr. 3 d. 1 p. 24 § 5 n. 30.

Fill. tr. 11 n. 149. Concina concerning and probable put thus Bonaventure concerning and the same Dionysius loc. cit., as Chapter II. Doubt. IV. On the Minister of this Sacrament. 69 If any Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, is to be understood regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one.

But this reason does not entirely commend itself, because (as we said in book 1, note 156.) Notandum II.) Probabiliter hujusmodi Monasteria praesumptum si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. locum sunt exempta, dum Tridentinum sess. 14 c. 5 de Reform. in fine appellat tam personas, quam loca exempta. The reason is more persuasive to me, because the reservation of cases (as we said in n. 581) no longer regards the penitent, but the confessor, to whom jurisdiction is limited: hence a confessor who cannot grant absolution to this penitent except by virtue of his bishop's faculty, must not absolve him, since such faculty has been limited by the same bishop. Ad eamdem rationem idem dici debet cum c. Lugo d. 20 n. 72 et aliis, si talis poenitens peccatum reservatum est in sua patria, commiserit in Dioecesi ubi reservatum non est: quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per alium triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria, quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per alium triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary est reservatum in sua patria commiserit in Dioecesi ubi reservatum non est; is tunc non poterit in propria Dioecesi absolvi a simplici Confessario. Doubt is 6.

Can bishops absolve penitents dwelling within their diocese from papal cases, and dispense with irregularities and suspensions reserved to the Pope? If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, as being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not

extraordinary, pertains to this dispensation, having been decided by Gregory XIII. (as stated in n. 36, p. 375) nothing prevents an episcopos from dealing with aliens even if these individuals perform functions such as those of a praetor or physician in his diocese. Regarding the absolution of sins however, it is common among Doctors that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed for another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennial limit, as being odious and strict, regards ordinarial election, not extraordinary. For this dispensation pertains, it was decided by Gregory XIII (as reported in n. 36 p. 375), that no Bishop can deal with aliens, even if those individuals happen to be serving the office of Praetor or Physician within his Diocese. The Bishop can beneficially absolve foreigners from Papal cases, provided they are secret, according to the faculty of Tridentine in c. Licet 6 sess. 24. Such as in the 3rd section, 2nd article, number 3, and on censure in the 4th section, 2nd article, number 12, chapter 2, number 11, paragraph ad 17, and matrix 1, 3rd decision, number 23, paragraph n. 12.

Bon. de Cens. d. 1 q. 3 p. 2 n. 5. et Barbosa in c. n. 43. cum Henr. Zero. Garcia, Naldo, Duardo, Navar. Nam, uti recte dicunt AA. praefati, subdit praesumptum dicuntur tales peregrini, qui in foro sacra-70 Lib. VI. Treatise.

IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance, the penitential acts are subject to the Diocesan Bishop mentally. This has been declared by the Sacred Congregation, c. de Censuris n. 10; it responded that an absent person can be absolved from his own diocese by the Bishop of the diocese in which he resides, not however by his own; explaining this on account of the Council in d. cap. Liceat speaking about sacramental absolution in the forum of conscience, which requires the presence. The same power is had by Vicars Capitulares during the vacancy of the See, as they commonly say, according to 2 c. 11 n. 13. Cross 1. 7 n. 135. et .

Henry and Barbosa in conjunction with Garcia. Gav. . 2 n. 6 ex quadam Declar. S. C. according to which it was said: In this Decree the reason is because such a faculty has been specially conceded to Bishops, and concessions should be strictly interpreted. Affirmant vero 5. et de Matrim. 1. 8 d. 3 num. 9 Croix 1. 7 num. 141. c. cum Praelect. n. 29. item Sayr. Duard. . . cited.

Reason: firstly because, as Fagnanus proves, names of Bishops come to be presumptuously called Princes by those who possess jurisdiction quasi episcopally exclusively for Bishops; and secondly because, when a concession is made in law, it has the reason of a law which should extend

to all cases where the same reasoning applies: but such reasoning undoubtedly applies both to Bishops and to these kinds of Princes, since otherwise their subjects would not have anyone to whom they could recur for absolution of the aforementioned cases. Neither does it hinder, he says. C. because concerning this there is no authentic confirmation, nor are they (as he says) necessarily obliged thereby. Whether regular prelates have this faculty toward subjects? It is affirmed by him at Chapter II.

Dub. IV. Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. 71 39 n. 18. according to the Bull of S. Pius V. But Croix denies, as cited, with the Dicastery according to the Decree. The Sacred Congregation and Mendon refute that Bull in the same place.

This however must be noted from the aforementioned Declaration of the Sacred Congregation (contra hoc si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria dicunt decisum esse si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Bishops who are extraneous to the Sacrament of Penance cannot absolve from the aforementioned cases, as declared presumptuously on page 375, Dilectus. To be noted as well is declared to be by the Sacred Congregation (according to Fagn. ibid., n. 34) that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary; if a Bishop incurs in some crime mentioned in said canon Liceat, he will have permission to appoint his own Confessor, even one outside his Diocese, for his own absolution with the same faculty by which he could absolve his other subjects. Notandum 3 ab eadem S. C. Concilii declaratim fuisse (apud Fagn. n. 37 et 38.) non esse tutum in conscientia, qui absolveretur aut quocum dispensaretur à proprio Episcopo in casibus, sive irregularitatibus, aut suspensionibus contractis ob crimen patratum coram duobus, vel tribus testibus, quia probari non potest. And thus they are reputed to be presumptuous who assert that it is hidden, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, should be understood regarding the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one; which cannot be proven.

But others commonly say that this is occult, if a Confessor be elected for a supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition of electing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strictly to be received in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one; that which, if a Confessor be elected for a supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition of electing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strictly to be received in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one. is not notorious, and although this may possibly be concealed through some equivocation, yet it can be proved by witnesses; thus 13 sect. 2 n. 2. I. 8 d. 34 n. 55. Bonac. de Cens. d. 1 q. 3 p. 2 n. 1. cum Avila, Reg. . Tourn. to. 2 p. 448 R. 3 cum Sayr. et tom. 3 p. 322 in fin. . Henriq. 1. cit. n. 26. cum Mol. Commission. Fagn. Gav., et aliis innumeris ex Glossa apud Tournely, quæ ait: quandoque dicitur occultum si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; hoc, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. probare potest.

Here Sanchius from Tournely, Bonac., with Avila, and with 92 Lib., teach. VI. Treatise. Chapter. Of the Sacrament of Penance.

Pelliz. Henry. Whether, however, a Bishop can dispense with vows for peregrinates? And whether, when hindered from going to the Pope through urgent necessity, he can presumptuously dispense in irregularities and impediments of Marriage? See what is said in book 1 on Law and book 3 on Vow, nos. 262 and 332. Whether, however, the faculty from Trent should be understood as granted to Bishops for cases and irregularities reserved beforehand by the Pope except those reserved before the Council? Dubit. 7. 1 n.

Florus et Garcias affirmant apud dictum, episcopum non posse absolvere Etonialem frangentem claustrum ab excommunicatione occulta reservata Pontifici, secundum Bullam sancti Pii V. Wherefore they likewise conclude that the same must be said concerning other excommunications imposed after Trent. But they very probably deny it, according to 6. c. 15 n. 73. with Sorbius, Bonaventura de Causis et de Censuris d. 1. q. 3 p. 2 n. 1. Delbene de Imm. Ecclesiae decet dies octavus dubia numero sexta decima.

Renzi t. 2 p. 285. with and with Boss. and Beja. Reason, because the Council indefinitely grants to the Lipschopians the faculty of absolution in whatever secret presumed cases may arise, reserving such to the Apostolic See; but where the law does not distinguish, we also must not distinguish. To the aforementioned declaration of Gregory XIII., the aforementioned authors respond that it does not authentically state anything on this matter. But this response does not suffice for me; for besides Florenum and Garciam, as mentioned above and Sanctarell, in his treatise on heresy c. 5 dub. 1 n. 1, and Zechium, and another author quoted in c., who testify to the truth of this declaration; it provides a great proof, found on p. 375, where he brings forward the same Declaration as firm; and to this author I do not seem to show little faith, especially since he himself held that office for fifteen years according to Cap. II. Doubt.

IV. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 75 The Secretaries of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, from whom it was more fitting to have the records of what had been done in that same Congregation: so much the more, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict it is to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, let this fact be explained with its own particular circumstances: for if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict it is to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Bishop of Florence petitioned, whether by virtue of Tridentine in cap., it would have been permissible to absolve some nun who had covertly and for a malicious end broken her enclosure, notwithstanding the Bull of Pius V which prohibits nuns from breaking their confinement or giving permission thereto, accompanying it with, etc. excommunication wherefore only except on the article of death can be remitted save by the Roman Pontiff? Several Cardinals believed that he could not absolve him, because a clause existed in the Bull permitting absolution only in the article of death, and because the Bull had been completed after the Council; but since others did not adhere to this opinion, the matter was referred to the Supreme Pontiff, who declared that the Bishop could not absolve, wherefore it should be observed with the mentioned faculty granted by the Tridentine Bishops according to the said chapter Liceat, derogated for cases contained in two Bulls, namely in the Bull of the Supper, and in this aforementioned Bull of Pius V, on account of derogatory clauses, specifically in the first, not contrary to the decrees of any Council: and in this second [Bull], except in the article of death. Hence we say: if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be

sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one, any Bull where these aforementioned clauses are found will remove from Bishops the faculty of absolving in cases reserved by the Pope.

But not other Bulls wherein there is no derogatory clause, as in 2 R. 21. Doubtful. 8. Whether bishops can absolve from cases secretly reserved by other bishops with cen- sure? He responds affirmatively, Bonaventure on Penitence, I, q. 3, p. 2, n. 6, and Pulte Cutillus in Practica III de Casibus reservatis, dubium 38. From this, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary; which, if a Confessor is chosen for the purpose of supplement, can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. In chapter Liceat, Tridentine let it be said: grant all Bishops permission to absolve sinners in whatever reserved cases of the Apostolic See presumed occult and secret.

From which particle it is sufficiently shown that the reserved cases are comprehended under the faculty of absolving, and from the reservations of communications by other Bishops. This opinion, Lib. 74. VI. Treatise. Fourth.

On the Sacrament of Penance. We once deemed it probable; but subsequently, being compelled by two declarations of the Sacred Congregation from 1712 in Thesauros Resolutionum S.C. to. 1, p. 392, we were forced to hold it negative. But especially from the Declaration issued by Blessed. XIV. die 20 augusti 1752 quæ incipit, Pias Christi fide- lum etc. Cum enim in Civitate Januensi consessum fuisset privilegium cu-dam Confraternitati sub invocatione S. Mariae de Succursu, ut Confratres eligere possent quemlibet Confessarium a Ordinario loci approbatum, cum facultate absolvendi eos in articulo mortis, et bis in vita à casibus praesumptum Sedi Apostolicæ reservatis; Pontifex declaravit per enunciatum privilegium, absolvendi facultatem... non vero praesumptum Ordinariis locorum reservatis... per Nos in præcitatis nostris Litteris numquam concessam fuisse, et consequenter absolutiones... contra præsentis Declarationis nostra tenorem forsan de præterito impertitas, aut in posterum impeditandas, nemini suffragari potuisse, sive posse,

decernimus, et declara- mus. See Bulls, tome 4. Bened.

XIV and the same regarding the Council in book 5, chapter 5, canon 9. There is doubt 9. Whether a Bishop can generally commit this power to other Priests from Trent? Henryq. de Matr., lib. 2, d. 40, n. 16 denies this, saying that he can only delegate in particular cases, and not generally. They infer this from the words of the Council in said chapter "Liceat," where it is conceded to Bishops the faculty either of absolving themselves per se, or of appointing a Virarium specially for that purpose.

But more probablie and communissimè affirm they that the Bishop can generally committ his vices to do absolution in casibus Papali- tiis occult- iiis, because thus other Sacerdotes are reputate specialiter deputari. Thus. c n. 17 et Dec. l. 2 c. 11 num. 23. 20 sect. 2 n. 9. Barbosa in 45 in fine, 2. Croix l. 7 num. 135 et l. 2 n. 54 cum Ratio, quia haec facultas competit Episcopis jure ordinario, cum ipsa sit annexa caput IL Dub. IV.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. The Episcopal dignity, and therefore can be generally delegated to another. Hence rightly says: cit. concerning the Vicar of the Bishop as not having the power to absolve from these cases by virtue of a general commission of the Vicariate, except specially committed to him by the Bishop. Regarding the absolution of cases: as for the faculty of dispensing in irregularities and suspensions, it is said to be imparted to Bishops in that same chapter, citing and referring to canon 46 at the end, along with others (contra Mar.). The other option is that the Episcopal authority can also generally delegate such power to any Priest whom the Bishop commits his own faculties to: this is done through their ordinary power which Bishops possess. Whether, however, Bishops can be absolved from heresy and from other cases by the Bull of Cœna?

See what is said in the Decretals, lib. 7, n. 82, where we uphold a negative sentiment: "8." Supra, auditis solius reservatis, potest ab igitur his absolvere, et reliqua inferiori committere, ex causa urgente: qualis tamen non est multitudo negotiorum, ut docent Filiolae et Filium; sed alia gravior; tum quia etiam occupatissimus potest dare facultatem adeundi alterum, cum onere posterius comparendi; tum quia integritas confessionis est de jure divino. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning the choice of a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, should be understood. Therefore, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning the non-choice of a Confessor beyond a

triennium, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, should be understood. No multitude of affairs can be sufficient cause to diminish confession, as rightly says Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1154 with Suarez especially today after proposition 59 condemned by Innoc. XI. quae dicebat: Licet sacramentaliter absolvere dimidiate tantum confessos, ratione magni concursus potentium, qualis velut potest contingere in die magnæ alicujus festivitatis, aut Indulgentiae. An autem possit Superior absolvere penitentem a reservatis, et pro aliis ejusdem remittere ad inferiorem?

Others universally affirming, as St. Cajetan. Sa, et Henr. apud 5 tr. 6 c. 12 n. 8 quia dicunt hanc esse Ecclesiae liber. VI. Tract. Four.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance. The Church's custom. Others, however, as in 31 s. r n. 10. 1. cited with Ad ri ano, Sylvest. et Cano deny this custom, and state that it is only permissible in a case of grave necessity, for example, if the Superior were not able to discharge some very serious business, and would consequently judge it necessary personally to hear the reserved sin. They admit that Lugo, d. 20, n. 78, 134. Croix dict. n. 1254 et et nollet eadem pecca- ta bis confiteri. This last does not seem improbable, granted the case with all these conditions; see the aforementioned notes n. 484 and 487.

5g6. " 9. Who has been absolved by the Superior in matters reserved, must afterward be absolved by them concerning any other matter: because there is no longer a necessity for material confession. The one who has been absolved by the superior regarding reserved cases is afterwards absolved by anyone: because there is no longer any matter necessary for Confession. Whoever sincerely confesses, not knowing that his sin is reserved or that the Priest may lack the power to deal with it in that respect, is nevertheless validly absolved; although there remains the obligation of making known such matters, Preparedness * (according to what is said 1. 7 n. 91). Similarly, if the Confessor reasonably believes that it is not reserved or that the Priest has the power, even so he should be considered reverently; his absolution avails. 29 * (With reference to the Rota of Lugo and see what is said n. 600.) * 11. Who confessing is mindful of him who has ordination power, even though it be delegated and reserved, having forgotten that something is validly reserved, afterward he can likewise confess this to a subordinate, and be absolved.

If any one shall be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is to be strictly and odiously received concerning ordinary election, not

extraordinary; even so it holds if previously he had possessed the power of ordination, or even if his former absolution, due to indisposition of the penitent or some other defect, had been invalid. The reason is, because he intended to absolve as much as he was able to. Therefore, even if he lifted the reservation as far as it was possible to do so without the Sacrament. V. Prep. in tertio praecipe quarto decimo sextodecim secundi tertii centuria trecentaduodecima.

It is asked. I. An cases discussed by Busemb. namely Ch. II. Dub. IV.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 77: if the penitent with good faith confesses a reserved sin lacking in power; or if he forgets that sin when accused thereof, or confesses it through urgent necessity, may the simple Confessor validly and licitly absolve him? Antoine denies on page 529 question 5, and speaking per se, his opinion is sufficiently probable; for as we said (n. 265). Questio. I., it is probable with Vasquez, Tournai, etc., that a simple confessor lacks jurisdiction in regard to one who has reserved, since such a judge is not competent; hence neither can he absolve those whose reservation was not made for him. However, the second opinion is common and more probable, affirming what they hold.

Lugo, Concina, and Ratio hold that although a confessor cannot absolve without a reasonable cause those who are not reserved to him, nor can he absolve those who are reserved to another in which jurisdiction he has no power; yet still, by this he does not thereby lose his power over the non-reserved. Consequently, when the penitent either confesses with good faith or is bound to do so, then it is rightly that he may be directly absolved from the non-reserved, and indirectly from the reserved. And since this sentiment is common, as Antoine himself acknowledges, and very probable, indeed certainly more probable as we have said: it can be well reduced to practice, for (as we confirmed in no. 573) it is morally certain that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, his confirmation can be properly established through another three years after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, being odious and strict when applied to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, should also apply in this case. Thus, with the probable opinion of the Church, jurisdiction can be suitably supplemented. It is asked II. An; si paenitens confessus sit Superatori quinque et inculpabiliter sit oblivisctus peccati reservati, poterit deinde aliquem ullum confiterti ac absolvi? The first common opinion asserts this, and thus Bus., as above, Lugo d. 2 n. 85 et 89 (where he calls it common), Sanchez de Matr. l. 8 d. 15 nu. 21 Pal, p. 15 § 6 n. 3 maintain it.

Ciera d. 1 n. 90. 9 ar. 4 n. 2. 43 (qui praesumptum asserunt communem)

et Escob.: l. r6 n. 510 cum Cano, Fill. et Adriano, et; idque videtur confirmari verbis illis, quæ Confessioni præmittuntur: De Sacramento Pœnitiæ. According to what I can do and you need, etc. And this applies even if the Confession is made before a delegate from the inferior; because it is still considered that the Superior desires to remove that through such reservation. The second opinion denies this, and they hold it. 3 1 sect. 4 num. 12. Antoine p. 53 o qu. 6 item Sylv. The Angel.

Rosel. and 20 n. 85 and rather probable he calls Holzrn. They say, let the reservation be not removed, whether the Confession be made to the Superior, or to a delegate. The reason is very urgent, because to remove the reservation requires that the sin be submitted to the judgment of a Superior; if an Absolutor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing an Absolutor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted from the election of ordinaries and not from the extraordinary. The end of the reservation (as we approved n. 58 t) is that not only are penitents restrained from abstaining from sin, but also that they receive a suitable medicine and penance. Wherefore it is not deemed that the reservation has been withdrawn, unless there be some positive indication from which a presumption arises that the Superior desired to remove the reservation, as correctly states Concina; or unless Penance (as he says) for this purpose the Superior, or one having authority, was aware of all those who were reserved and made known his intention by absolving them all. Neither does Suarez n. 20 inadequately receive when the privilege was granted in favor of penitence, as is the case with the privilege of Jubilee and the Bull of Crucifixion.

However, excepting these three aforementioned exceptions, I deem the second opinion more probable: and this Sylvius maintains in volume 4, supplement, question 20, article 2 near the end, agreeing with Sylvius, Angelus, Adria诺:".$<|im_start|>⚗⚗⚗⚗⚗⚗⚗⚗ To arm. tom. 6 p. 2 p. 131. It is allowable that the first appear presumptuously probable, both because of the authority of DD., who (as he himself confesses in the Council) commonly teach it; and because it can probatively be presumed that the Superior consents, so that the reservation may be removed, always and penitently he acknowledges it to the one having power. Furthermore, however, it is my opinion that a reservation should not be removed when there would be a positive presumption present, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not

extraordinary. If the Superior had been aware of a reserved sin, he would have withheld absolution. Inquiry III. By means of the confession, is an innocently invalid reservation removed?

He denies that either a Confession by an Ordinary or one made by a delegated Confessor can be validly regarded as inculpably invalid and thus remove the reservation. Reason, because the Superior does not lift the reservation except by sacramental absolution; hence, when the confession is invalid, the reservation is not lifted; but on the contrary, the inferior holds that since nothing can be done outside the Sacrament in what is reserved, whenever the Sacrament is null and void, the sins remain reserved. But common opinion affirms and holds that to be more probable. Section 31, chapter 4, number 10. Wigandt translates 14 n. 77. Lugo distinguishes chapter 20 number 106 question 6.

Reply 2. last note number 2. Cross n. 1475. 7. p. 5 § 5 n. 9. cum Vasq. Fill. King. Nunno, cap. 13 n. 41. When always and subjectively one submits his own sin to the judgment of a Superior or another having authority, then already the purpose of reservation is achieved.

It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor be chosen as an addition, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus both Ordinarius and Delegatus will not lift the reservation except through sacramental absolution, which being absent here, since the Confession itself is null; for it is responded that if a Confessor be chosen as an addition, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus both Ordinarius and Delegatus will not lift the reservation except through sacramental absolution, which being absent here, since the Confession itself is null; for it is responded that if a Confessor be chosen as an addition, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Superior can well remove the reservation without sacramental absolution, as Confina himself confesses. Let it however be noted that the inferior cannot remove the reservation except through sacramental absolution; yet, since the subject sin is brought to him, then when the Superior himself, having now reached the end of the reservation, is considered as having removed

it, this is done by virtue of established custom (as they say, by firm authority). It is queried IV. Is a reservation removed through confession if there is culpably no guilt?

The first opinion denies it, and so do Concina, Holzrn., etc.; they call it absolutely true, but not well, for these latter ones absolutely maintain the opposite. Reason, because the superior's will is not presumed, § 80 Lfb. VI. Treatise. Fourth.

Of the Sacrament of Penance, so that the subject might obtain benefit from his own inequity. This judgment is indeed very probable; yet the opposite one is far more common, and it lacks no probability. Therefore, the second opinion affirms this, and all those cited for the second opinion in the preceding question hold it, excepting those quoted in the present question. Reason, because the same argument runs for sacrilege as for one accused and confessing nothing; for the end of confession is different from that of reservation: the end of confession is that the sin may be remitted; but the principal and direct end of reservation is that those who commit such sins reserved thereby are subjected to the judgment of a Superior. Therefore, when the subject offers his sin to the Superior, and accepts penance imposed by him, even though he confesses sacrilegiously, the end of reservation has already been obtained, although the sin itself may not be remitted. Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Autem pec- cator ex tali iniquitate commodum reportet, hoc per accidens evenit; nam licet ex voluntate interpretativa nollet auferre reservationem, si sacrilegium agnosce- ret; tamen ex voluntate actuali jam vult auferre.

However, Wigandt and Lugo rightly object, if one says that (as Lugo himself states) in an innocent confession of sacrilegious guilt the reserved sin is improperly forgotten to be confessed, because it is least presumed that the Superior, in such sacrilegious confession, wishes to remove the reservation of a sin not reported to him. Item excipit Suarez, si poenitens habuerit animum non vitandi in posterum peccatum illud reservatum, vel non implendi poenitentiam impositam; dict vero tolli reservationem, si animum mutet. Item rectè addit Bonac.: semper teneri poenitentem, etiamsī ab illo peccato reservato inferior absolvit, implere poenitentiam à Superiori impositam. It is to be received (as we said in no. 537) that an invalid confession, whether culpably or inculpately made during a Jubilee; because there, since the Pontiff does not provide the faculty of absolving from reserved cases except at the end so that faithful persons may profit from the Jubilee, it is not considered as wishing to remove a reservation if

they join the Jubilee; see what was said in no. 537. What.

Chapter Two. Book Chapter II. Dub. Sixth. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 81.

Response 2. He can reserve to himself the absolution. He himself preserving. 2. Of him in spiritual jurisdiction the Superior. » 3.

To whom he himself has delegated. 4. The inferior priest, when the superior cannot approach, for example, a reserved Pope, can absolve the Bishop who cannot go to Rome, those in major Penance chapels of cathedrals, although they have ordinary power to absolve, nevertheless they cannot absolve from reserved penances either by the Bishop nor from the Bishop, and still less delegate that, as is stated in the Decree. The Sacred Congregation of the Council on the sixth day of July in the year one thousand six hundred and forty-seven at Pitton. Regarding this they hold: nine articles, article four, note one. Barbosa 8. R. 11, qui repugnasset contrariam consuetudinem (si fortè alicubi adest) tamquam irrationabilem. « Resp. 3 Extra periculum mortis: de quo v. dicta dubio superiore; nullus inferior per se, et directe absolevere potest, nisi ex jure vel privilegio concedatur. »

It is said to be a reward per se; because indirectly and by accident it is collected from the aforementioned statements. It is said 2. Unless, however, from cases involving Papal absolution, a Bishop can himself, or as Vicar, release those who are concealed, as Vadianus resolves. Mendicantes ex vi juris communis non possunt absolvere à reservatis Episcopo: quia ut sic non habent potestatem majorem Parochis; et privilegium, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. circa hoc habuerunt, sublatum est decreto Urbani VIII anno 1628.* (Hoc etiam confirmatur ex Prop. 12 inter damnatas ab .)* Excipit tamen Aversa cum Diana p. 8 t. 7 res. 71 eos casus, qui Episcopis à jure tantum reservantur; imò 51 non audet probare, nisi ad Episcopum non patet regurus; tunc enim ab ipso debet regulari sicut de ordinario episcopalibus. Lib. VI.

Tract. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. be it reserved to you to be able to absolve, such things would be fitting from the Pope reserved. 58. See «presumed Prep. q. 19 d: 1.»

It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be

sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary; hence, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Regulares nequeant absolvere a casibus reservatis ab Episcopis, ut communiter dicunt cum aliis. n. 13 et Cabass. T. J. lib. 1 c. 11 n. 5 ex Bulla . And si hoc casus sint reservati a Episcopo seu a ejus Synodo, ut recte dicit Croix n. 1628 cum .); nam id si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria et non extraordinaria, agitur à Synodo principaliter ab Episcopo agitur qui est caput illius. Whether Regulars may absolve from cases reserved to Bishops by common right?

See below in book 7 n. 99 where we shall say that it is more probable, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can be confirmed well by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, is handled by the Synod, mainly by the Bishop who is the head of that assembly. Whether, however, Regulars can absolve from cases reserved to Bishops according to common law? Now regarding whether Regulars can absolve from those six cases reserved by Clement VIII, namely, clerus' percussion, duel, violation of ecclesiastical immunity, violation of cloister for an evil end, real simony, and confidential simony; the faculty of absolving from the aforementioned cases was expressly removed from Regulars by Clement. See book 7 note 75. Therefore, it is probable that those who procure an abortion of a animated fetus can be absolved, since this case has not been reserved by Clemente; see cited note 99 at the end. 800 « Resp. 4.

If the Confessor doubts whether the penitent's lapse is a mortal sin reserved for judgment, and if this doubt is a positive one, he can (following the probable opinion, and judging probabilistically not to be reserved) absolve. If however the doubt is negative, some, like Armil, deny that one can absolve. Fillius. Secundus. Sectio secunda. It is asked I. Whether, in a doubt, or one who is penitent incurs a reserved case, can a simple confessor absolve him?

If the doubt pertains to the fact, namely, if the penitent doubts whether he

has committed a grave sin or not, it is commonly held that if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, his decision can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a different confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, pertains to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Therefore, anyone could absolve him; for the reservation must be strictly interpreted, hence it should be understood as applying to certainly grave sins; this is according to Concina, Cap. II. Doubt. IV. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 83 p. 567 n. 15. d. 40 sect. 6 n. 5. Lugo distinguished 20, number 18, chapter 10, note 23, and the Decretists, soon to be cited with references elsewhere (contrary to Wigandt, treatise 14, number 53). But if there is a doubt of law, namely, whether some sin is reserved, Concina, and Wigandt in loco, as well as Arm. v., deny it.

Case n. 13 and Antoine p. 528 question 2. Reason: for when there is doubt whether a sin is reserved, there is also doubt whether the confessor has presumed the power to absolve; hence, since the confessors have only a doubtful faculty, they cannot absolve. But together commonly affirm the DD., besides the . 11. cc., Filius docens in tractatus 21 caput 4 n. 172. Escob. 1. 16 n. 447: cum Sa, res. 1. 5 c. 4 n. 7; . 643; . 9 art. 2 n. 4. Diana p. 4 tract. 3.

R. 4: Sporer p. 162 n. 743 cum c. 13 n. 16, cum Aversa, Hurt. et aliis. And this, whether the doubt be positive or negative, because the same reasoning applies to both cases. The reason is, firstly (as we have said), because strict interpretation must be placed on the reservation; secondly, because the condition of the possessor is better: hence, although there may be doubt whether the sin has been reserved, it is certain that the penitent possesses the faculty of absolution. Moreover, since this judgment is common and certainly probable, it may be presumptuously thought that the Church supplies jurisdiction, according to what was said in no. 573: and thus the opposite reason is answered. Neither hinders, as Concina objects, that if some Confessor be chosen as supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not to extraordinary.

Clement VIII prohibuerit omnes Confessarios praesumptum privilegiatos absolvere a casibus, praesumptum dubiis in bulla Cena reservatis, et in Extrav. Having been read, it shall be declared that the decision of the cleric is reserved to the Pope; when there is doubt whether it is a light or grave case. For such prohibitions more firmly establish our opinion, if one confesses for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another

triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a confessor beyond a three-year term, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with respect to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if one confesses for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a confessor beyond a three-year term, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with respect to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Confessor potest absolvere in aliis casibus, quae sunt dubie reservata; nam exceptiofirmat regem. This however must be known: if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor for more than three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted, pertains to ordinary election, not to extraordinary; that is, if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor for more than three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted, pertains to ordinary election, not to extraordinary. Clement (as reported by many) in the year 1602.

That decree has been moderated by removing those words, with reservations left to be decided dubiously. They limit however this judgment in Bonac. and §4 Lib. IV. Treatise. Fourth.

On the Sacrament of Penance. cc. and Bonasp. et Alph. de Leone apud c.) if a crime is held to be certain in external forum, because then the same judgment must be formed for internal forum. But more accurately all SS. refute this limitation for our opinion, and especially through citation. Sporer, et; tamen aliud est in foro interno, ubi omnino credendum est poenitenti, cum ipse tantum possit esse suae conscientiae testis. It is sought II. An qui confessus est inferiori peccatum dubie reservatum, omnino liberetur à reservationi, etiam si postea illud cognoscat ut certum?

Concina denies on p. 508 n. 16 that, although anyone who confesses may absolve from a dubiously reserved sin due to the dubiety of the act, nevertheless when the penitent subsequently remembers that sin with certainty, he is bound to approach a Superior; for confession of a dubiously reserved sin does not make it cease to be a reserved sin. But commonly others affirm, as Lugo distinguishes in the 20th chapter note 22. Escob. lib. 16 n. 451. Sporer p. 262 n. 734. 6 art. 2 n. 4 cum Bald. ex. lib. 4 c. 44 et Ratio, quia cum peccatum dubiè reservatum est confessum, jam directè est remissum (ut ipse Concina n. 15 concedit), ac proinde manet directè ablata reservatio: unde, quàmvis teneatur poenitens, cum

recordatur peccati certi, priùs confessi ut dubii, illud iterùm tamquàm certum confiteri, ut ad sup- plendam integritatem illud exponat, uti erit in con- scientia, ejusque cognitam gravitatem Confessario ma- nifestet, juxta dicta n. 458, tamen non tenetur amplius se sistere Superiori pro ablatione reservationis, quia, ablato peccato ablata est etiàm reservatio. Whether one who has sinned with confidence in license can be absolved from reserved cases?

It seems to deny; but it must be affirmed with the common opinion held in chapter four, section fifty-four, note eighteen. Fill. tr. 8 n. 262 Lugo n. 130 cum . Chapter II. Dub. Fourth.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 85 etc. and Opposites, It is Inquired IV. Whether a license to absolve given after withholding may be extended to sins committed subsequent thereto? It must be distinguished: If a concession has been granted precisely for the narrated sins, or for those committed in every respect, it can validly apply only to them. But if the license is granted indefinitely; most commonly and very probatively according to Lugo, dist. 20 n. 123, cum Bon. et Præpos. 7 cum Passer. Mansi, and Gabr.

S.V. et cum Aversa, Leand Dic. etc. Tamen tamen, recte limitante, non interponatur magna distantia (quatenus ultra mensem: ut ait; intellige, si pro quodam particulari poenitentiam sit tantum impertita licentia. He also rightly warns Roncag., that the aforementioned judgment does not proceed if the granted license was intended for some festival. Here are some additions concerning the reservation of the casuistic question regarding nuns. Therefore, it is questioned number 60a. Whether nuns are subject to cases and censures reserved generally by the Ordinary in the diocese? They deny, Cesped. and others at place . and in Alexandria.

I. c. Quia, quando verba generalia concurrent cum veritate recte legislatricis, tunc comprehendi sunt omnes qui in lege non sunt expressè excepti. And this is more true. It is asked VI. Whether the aforementioned reservation applies. 86 Lib. Sixth.

Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. presumptuously exempted nuns? It affirmatively states with probable likelihood and [quotation] from the fifth book of casuistry regarding resolutions, chapter three, note four. Because in the Constitution.

Incomprehensible, Gregory XV established that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be adequately confirmed by another triennium

after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Exempted confessors of nuns shall be altogether approved by the Bishop of the place: therefore the Bishop (thus writes): so presumptuous a power can limit cases indeed. They, however, still deny probatively n. 3 and P. de cap. 6 § 2. Because what is common to all, as he asserts: since exempt monasteries are wholly outside the bishop's jurisdiction, and if they were outside the territory, as commonly said there by Bona. Let it be said concerning the superior that the Bishop may limit time, place, and persons; but nothing is to be said about sins which are otherwise reserved to prelates regular and monastic nuns exempted.

It is queried VII. Whether an Bishop, in the matter of a cloistering, can reserve cases concerning exempted Moniales, for example, if by an open door he speak with seculars, as his delegate from the Apostolic See might do? It affirms from . cited. Q. 12. with Baucio. Reason, because (as they say) standing delegation granted by this is collated from the Decretum of Clement VIII, in which Regulars are prohibited from absolving according to any privilege from cases specially reserved Ordinarily.

But this reason is not sufficiently proven; hence, it does not seem improbable the opposing opinion of Di-anæ and Pasqua-pud, who say that the aforesaid delegation is considered by bishops to refer solely to external forum; while the words are: Bon. VIII. The Sacred Synod, renewing its constitution, enjoining upon all Bishops, orders that in all Monasteries subject to them, the chapter be closed; but in other monasteries under Apostolic delegation, closure shall be carried out according to the Quaestor's authority. Chapter I. The Doubt Concerning the Fifth. Concerning the Minister of that Sacrament: 87 Sanctimonialium, where it has been violated, diligently restore ... they shall procure.

Here lastly to be noted is that, according to 110 qu. 9 R. 1: if any Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is understood of ordinary election, and not of extraordinary, ex decreta à Sancta Consistorio emanata anno 1601 et 1602 auctoritate Clementis VIII. et anno 1607 auctoritate Pauli V., any Confessors presuming to absolve in casibus reservatis Papae vel Episcopos, incur in very fact anathema resuspended by the Pope himself. DOUBT V. What is the Office and obligation of the Confessor? What is the office of the Confessor? When therefore may or ought the Confessor defer absolution? (Remissivè ad n. 462 et seq.) 604 Qu. I.

Whether or not a penitent may refuse absolution to one who adheres to a probable opinion? What if he adhered to a false sentence, but one considered probable? Qu. II. Is it expedient for the Confessor to use more rigid or more benign judgments? Which penitents can or cannot be absolved by the Confessor? Under what circumstances is the Confessor bound to question the confessors? How to instruct and dispose them as much as possible?

Instruction for Confessors. 609 How ought they to be admonished concerning their own obligations? 610 What if they foresee that the admonition will not prove fruitful? 611 Inf. I. What if he notices that the penitent has contracted a marriage invalidly with good faith? What if marriage ought to be contracted? What if the bridegrooms come forward when everything is ready? Inf. II. Whether he is always to be exhorted concerning the making of restitution?

Infra. III. What if the fear of scandal for others is feared? Ex cip. 1. 615. When damage is against the common good. 616 Ex cip. 2. When a penitent asks.

From clause 3. When a brief fruit is hoped for. Whether, however, a warning should be given concerning the fruit and harm in doubt? The confessing penitent must be in grace. How then does he sin who successively grants absolutions in a mortal state? (Remitted according to l. 5 n. 50.) 618 What if he hears Confession only in a mortal state? Remiss. 68 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. To this 1. 6 n. 50. (And what if necessity arise for absolving? ibid.). 619 How is the Confessor bound to consider defects committed by himself? 620 Doubt. I.

To what is the Confessor bound, if he has erred regarding the value of the Sacrament? Doubt. II. For what purpose has he been absolved from making restitution? And is he bound to make restitution if, having become aware of the error, he does not caution? What if culpably deobligated, when he was disposed to repentance, and subsequently, in a state of penitence, refuses again to heed the admonition?

What if he merely omits to give warning? 622 Dub. IV. Can it happen that the penitent be advised about these deficiencies without the latter's license outside Confession? 623 What is the obligation concerning the hearing of penitents to confess? 624 Is the confessor bound by parochial duty to absolve a moribund sinner in peril of death, even though he is not the

parish priest? 625 Can it be safe in conscience for a simple priest who refused to exercise the ministry of confessing, provided there was a great spiritual necessity among the people? 603 « Resp. 1. The office of Confessor is to absolve those who are properly disposed, and no other; likewise to care for the rectitude of judicial judgment, especially when it has been begun; and to assist and counsel the guilty with prudent caution. The reason for the first [thing] is, that it may not be more severe to the penitent.

Reason thus, lest a sacrilege be committed. The reason for the third one is the same: because it ought to care that the absolution be efficacious. Wherefore it revolves. The reason of the third is the same: » and because it ought to take care that absolution be efficacious. Although at times absolution is expediently deferred for one who can licitly be absolved; yet this happens rarely, and almost never without the consent of the penitent: because it can involve a grave danger to him either while or after. See 2.

He is to be absolved who adheres to the probable sentence; because he is disposed [therefor]. It is asked I. Whether a penitent may be absolved who wishes to follow an opinion contrary to that which has been three times condemned: Cap. II. Dub. IV.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 89 sarius? The first opinion denies this, and such is held by Concina on page 702, note 1, and Gon-zalez et al., according to Croix, book 1, number 452. Reason, because the penitent is bound to abide by the judgment of the Confessor, who is the Judge; otherwise, he would be indisposed for absolution. The second however common thesis and to be followed teaches, not only that it is possible, but that one is bound to presume under a grave Confessor that he who wishes to adhere to a probable opinion will absolve the penitent, even though the opposite may appear more probable to the Confessor. Wherefore, Section 32, paragraph 5, Soto in Four Decretals, Book 18, Question 2, Article 5, ad 5, §; Chapter 2, paragraph 17, question 10, number 197, note 740; Canon 6, note 44.

Roncalli c. 2 Reg. 4 et 6 Croix 1. 1 n. 452. Sporer t. 1 pag. 11 n. 47. . 7 art. 2 n. 6. Laymann. I. 1 tr. 1 c. 5 n. 10. cum Vasq. Decretum, librum 1, caput 9, nota 28. cum Syro, Mana. Polanch. and many others.

And in this many still agree with the rigid opinion, namely Pontassus and Victoria; whose places and words we have given from lib. 1 n. 25., and especially Cabassutius T. J. l. 3 c. 13, who says thus: « (Every Confessor ought to absolve a penitent who is unwilling not to abstain from some work, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be

confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being as odious and strict as it is considered in ordinary election, but not in extraordinary one, is licit: although according to the probable authority of some pious and learned men, which has not been condemned by Church authority, it is allowed that such is less probable than another authority followed by the Confessor). » The same doctrine teaches Cardinal. Tolunius libri tertii caput xx numerus vii. ubi ait: Cum aliquid sit sub opinione, si casu accidit Confessarium esse opinionis, esse illicitum; et pœnitentem, esse licitum; potest pœnitens obligare confessarium ut ipsum absolvat in sua opinione. And he concludes, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, that then the Confessor might follow either opinion, although he himself would approve one of those. The same Navarus says in his fourth work: If there are contrary opinions of Doctors, one which the Confessor follows and another which the penitent follows, and the Confessor believes himself to be supported by evident text or reason, the penitent is doubtful, he should not absolve him. When if Congo Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. The penitent is not fortified with such a sufficiently strong reason; rather, he makes use of one that is approximately equal or nearly equal, and if he has for himself some renowned teacher to instruct him, he may absolve him; as we held after Adrian in c. Si quis autem, d. 7 n. 66. Thus: for although confessors are not bound to absolve penitents before hearing them, nevertheless, after having heard them, they are bound to absolve those who are properly disposed.

The same is taught by St. Caution: Let the Confessor beware lest he be precipitate in giving a verdict on mortal sin when it is not certain and clear; and where there are many and solemn opinions differing on whether it is licit or illicit... He should consider if any Confessor shall be chosen for supplementation, so that his confirmation might well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in matters of ordinary election and not extraordinary. For it is safer, namely, if any Confessor shall be chosen for supplementation, so that his confirmation might well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in matters of ordinary election and not extraordinary. Therefore abstain from such [things] (Extrâde Spons.).

Juven.) non tamen contemnet contrarium facientes, seu contra- hancere opinionem tenentes, ne propter hoc (nota) deneget absolutionem: sed (ut dict Guil.) dicat Confessor, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. illud faciendo non est tutum, sed dubium, et ideo sibi benè provideat; si autem omnino (idest evidenter) conscientia Confessoris dicret illud esse mortale, nec possit conscientiam deponere (id est per judicium reflexum, nempe si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. pœnitens, cum sit dispositus, efformando sibi conscientiam de honestate actionis, jus habeat ad absolutionem), si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post I. §. From these, added is the Glossa. Sed cum illud tale esset contra communem opinionem DD. et communiter sic servatur à Sapientibus, quavsi aliquem Doctor audiret contrarium tenere non de levi (idest sine solida ratione), debet illi adhaerere. The same is confirmed more clearly by St. Thomas 20 at the end, saying: If (the penitent) believes, or if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this reason, if someone is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. This being so, if someone is chosen as a supplement, he must acknowledge conscientiously that this can be considered a sin, provided he diligently inform himself about that matter, whether it is a sin or not. But given, if a confessor is chosen as a

supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Doubt. V. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. To absolve him, nor to consider him incapacitated for absolution, because this opinion proceeds from reason and not from perversity. Add to these S. Raymundus, who in lib. 3 tit. de Pcenit. et Rem. § 21 writes: Tamen unum consulens, si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; non sis nimis pronus judicare mortalia peccata, ubi tibi non constat per certam scripturam... alioquin possent induci homines in desperationem. The most learned Sylvius teaches in the same article 2. 2 q. 154 ar. 2, speaking of superfluous ornament of women, where he says: If confessors are not able clearly to perceive whether there is a mortal or only a venial sin there, let them persuade so far as they can that the penitent abstain; yet if he wills not, let them not cause conscience about a mortal sin against him, lest henceforth he commit mortally what otherwise he would not have committed; nor let them deny absolution.

The reason for the urgency of this sentiment is, because the penitent, after having made his confession, being disposed therefor, has a strict right to absolution, which would gravely injure him by denying it the confessor; furthermore, because he deprives him of the grace of the Sacrament, and also obliges him to undergo great trouble, namely, to repeat before another his grave sins. Nor does it hinder to say that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict when considering ordinary election, but not extraordinary, because then the penitent would not be disposed to follow the judgment of the Confessor, if he does not wish to do so. For it is replied, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict when referring to ordinary election, not extraordinary, is such that the penitent, who is disposed but does not wish to follow the judgment of the Confessor, may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation. Confessor non sit judex opinionum, quas paenitens sequi tenetur, sed tantum dispositionis sui paenitentis, ut patet ex Tridentino sess. 14 c. 5. (cujus verba retulimus lib. 3 n. 669.) ubi Sacerdotes ad hoc

tantum dicuntur judices à. Christo Domino constituti, ut ad eos deferant fideles peccata sua, et ipsi absolutionem eis impertiuntur vel denegent juxta eorum dispositionem, debitamque pro modo culpae poenitentiam imponant.

Dispositio autem pœnientis consistit tantùm in habendo verum dolorem de peccatis confessis, et firmam voluntatem non peccandi in posterum. Therefore, the judgment of the Confessor regarding the disposition of the penitent in this respects consists solely in recognizing that, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be accepted from ordinary election, not extraordinary, implies that the penitent truly grieves over his own sins, and truly proposes not to repeat them. If a penitent wishes to follow either this or that opinion, let him do so, hoc g2 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Four. Of the Sacrament of Penance. It does not properly relate to the judgment of the Confessor unless he makes this judgment, in which case it is evident that the opinion of the penitent is clearly false. Regarding that matter concerning those opinions which revolve around the aforementioned disposition of the penitent or regarding the presumed administration of the Sacrament, for example, if the Confessor judges that he does not have jurisdiction, the penitent should adhere to the judgment of the Confessor; and the Confessor is bound to follow his own judgment; otherwise, by absolving without due jurisdiction or by judging someone unworthy himself, he commits an act contrary to his own conscience. As regards, however, other opinions concerning the obligation of the penitent, namely those things that the penitent is to do or avoid, the confessor is not a judge, nor can he bind the penitent to follow his own opinion, who wishes to follow the contrary one, which he thinks can be rightly held without ground, as Adrian has most properly declared in question 5. Dub 7 dicentis: Si a pluribus DD. contrarium teneatur, non debet Sucer- dos adeo de se praesumere ut totum velit in suam opinionem (quae forsitan erronea est) coarctare.

Hence, when from one side the penitent himself shapes a judgment regarding the honesty of some action, and on the other hand the Confessor does not have an evident certain knowledge of its falsehood, he is bound to absolve him, as being sufficiently disposed. And then it can be permitted, in fact it is required, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, that his confirmation might be well established by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious

and strict when taken from an ordinary election rather than an extraordinary one, should be understood. For if a penitent follows his own opinion, he may not be prevented from doing so since (as we said) the Confessor is not a judge of controversies; otherwise, for instance, if a penitent were a theologian-Confessor and wished to follow an opinion which he himself considered probable or at least certain without foundation, the Confessor might refuse him absolution, should he hold a contrary opinion, which may indeed be erroneous but this can in no way be said, considering that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, his confirmation might be well established by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict when taken from an ordinary election rather than an extraordinary one, should be understood. For in such a case the penitent sins by following his own opinion; but if he does not sin, then he is sufficiently disposed, thus such a person has the right to absolution. Add that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood odiously and strictly in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary; hence, if a Confessor were chosen for supplement, he could be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood odiously and strictly in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the Confessor were unable to absolve those who wish to follow an opinion less probable, according to Chapter III. Dub. V.

Regarding the minister of this sacrament, it seems that many inconveniences would follow what he himself considers probable. Let us suppose a case, namely, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he might well be confirmed through another three-year period after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, should be understood; that is, if someone should have accepted money simoniacally, according to some he is bound to refund the received price to him who gave it, while others hold that restitution should be made to the Church or the poor; suppose further that among two confessors one held that the giver should be refunded, considering this opinion more probable, and another held that restitution should be made to the Church because he holds a contrary judgment; I ask in this case, to which Confessor's judgment the penitent should conform himself, since he is bound by both of their judgments? And if it should happen that a reward appears to have been given unworthily, and afterwards he confesses this second time, whether ought he to make

restitution a second time? Moreover, si quilibet poeniteis teneretur sequi opinionem probabilierem sui Confessarii, sequeretur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. vix ullus Confessariorum, vel Theo- logorum (adhuc rigidioris sententiæ) posset absolutionem sacramentalem recipere, nam vix umquam casus posset accidere, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. horum aliquis invenerit Confessarium, qui non habeat ut improbabiles, aut saltem minus probabiles, plures opiniones, quas tamquam probabiliores ille tenet. Hence let us consider another case in thought: Two confessors hold two contrary opinions, each of which appears to them more probable; if one wishes to confess himself to the other, he should (according to the judgment of Fagnani and his associates) set aside his own opinion, capturing the intellect, so that he may not offend his confessor's judgment.

Against this, however, if another afterwards confesses to him, the second confessor should resume his own opinion, which appears more probable to him; for then he should judge according to his own judgment, and should oblige that person to renounce the opinion which he had previously imposed on himself; and there would be a comedy worthy of laughter, which would occur daily among confessors. Who will believe that Christ, the Lord, desired to oblige confessors and penitents with such burdens in the Sacred Penitential Confession? Besides, it would easily follow, if a Confessor should be chosen as a supplement, that his confirmation might well be secured by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, since when any one approaches to receive this Sacrament, de gî Lib. VI. Treatise.

Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. He who receives the penitent's confession should inquire into all the opinions which the penitent holds

and to which he directs his penitents, so that if he finds him having some opinion which seems less probable to him, he obliges him to abandon it; and it would rightly be thought that the Confessor should inquire thus: because he should not doubt imprudently, but rather that among all those thousands of opinions, easily many more than one opinion will exist that the Confessor considers less probable, and therefore unworthy of being held. From all these things it follows, that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one: for if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one. A Confessor is not indeed a judge of opinions which concern the obligations of penitents; but only of their dispositions; namely, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Let him therefore grieve and propose that God may not be offended, and believe his conscience secure, and not tremble to follow some opinion. Wherefore Cabassutius, although this Author be a promoter of more rigorous discipline, (in.

Theor. 14) speaking concerning confessors who compel their penitents to abandon their own opinions, that they may follow theirs, he says thus: Let each one prescribe whatever laws of austere life he wishes for himself; let them however beware lest these censorious censors tyrannically suppress the licit liberty of opinion before God. But thou shalt say, The judge of the external forum ought to judge according to the probable opinion of one party, although the other party has a probable opinion for itself; therefore the penitent cannot be absolved who wishes to follow a probable opinion against his own more probable one. Response is made: The reason between the external forum judge and the sacramental one is widely disparate; for in the external forum, where truth concerning a thing is at issue, whether it pertains to one party or the other, the judge who is bound to render each their right must indeed adjudicate the case for him who has the more probable claim, and cannot certainly adjudicate otherwise, for him who holds an opinion less probable; for such probability cannot be brought about if a confessor should be chosen as a supplement, which can well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three

years, as odious and strict in interpretation is regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary, should not make it so that the more probable case does not belong to him who has the more probable claim, and consequently the judge would act unjustly if he did not adjudicate such matter for himself. Confessor Chapter II. Dub.

V. On the Minister of this Sacrament. But indeed, whenever his opinion is not evidently certain, he cannot (as we have said) oblige the penitent to follow that; whence then not only can he, but is also bound to, permit him to follow his own opinion, always and as a penitent shaping his conscience about the honesty of the act according to that opinion, because then he is sufficiently disposed and has the right to absolution through the completed Confession. And they say this judgment: c. Lugo d. 23 n. 47. Busenb. lib. 1 d. 2 n. 3. . c. n. 30. cum Valent. et Manue. ac Croix l. 1 n. 443. cum nam si illa opinio habuerit aliquam existimandam probabilitatem, ut Sanchez ait si probabilis reputaretur inter Doctores probatae auctoritatis, et poenitens vere censeret illam esse probabilem, tunc non poterit Confessarius ei denegare absolutionem. Idem Sotus loco supra citato ita dicit: Quis sacerdos existimat opinionem esse falsam, non tamen inde existitmare debet sibi non licere ipsum absolvere si quidem propter probabilitatem ex causa illius a culpa.

This however shall be admitted solely when the opinion of the penitent has some degree of probability, so that the Confessor, though he does not regard it as certainly probable, yet doth not consider it altogether false; for against this, if the Confessor hath a certain principle according to his own opinion, by which he seeth no reason to respond with certainty and clearly knoweth the opinion of the penitent (although some Doctors defend it) to be based on an erroneous foundation and the reasons thereof spring from fallacious equivocation, then I say as doth Navarro and S. Antonino in the places above cited. The penitent cannot be absolved by the confessor, whom he sees persistently willing to follow an opinion manifestly erroneous. Whether, however, the Confessor were bound to admonish the penitent who in good faith desires to use some improbable opinion, if he foresees that the admonition will prove unprofitable? See article n. 610. Furthermore, when we discuss this doubt, where others (but few) say that the Confessor sins if he absolves according to 96 Lib.,

VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. A penitent who wishes to follow a less probable opinion; whereas other authors, very grave and by far the majority, both from the ancient and the more recent, say that he sins if he does not absolve; given this common judgment fortified by so many authorities and reasons, I do not see how the Confessor can deny absolution to one who wishes to follow an opinion which appears probable

to himself, even perhaps more probable, if not directly, at least reflexively, as commonly the probabilists' authors judge. For following a probable opinion in the concurrence of a more probable is considered by them to enable one to embrace a sentiment that is indirectly but possibly confirmed with more weighty foundations and supported by the common authority of eminent Doctors. Question NoneII.

In a deficiency of opinions, is it expedient for the Confessor to resort to more rigid or more lenient opinions? Recte ait Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 1737 si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si pœ- nitens ostendat se paratum ad sequendum id, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., est tutius, teneatur Confessarius (per se loquendo) eum dirigere secundùm sententias tutiores; quia, cum hoc sit majoris perfectionis, tenetur quidem Confessarius incumbere majori profectui sui poenitentis. Spectat autem ad prudentiam Confessarii deinde perpendere, utrum tutior vel minus tuta sententiæ usus suo poenitenti sit profuturus. Therefore intrinsically speaking, even though it is itself more secure and perfect, yet it will be more dangerous to impose on many the obligation of always working according to rigid; laws; hence Gerson de vita spir. p. 3 Lect. 4. Collection 10 wrote: So that through such public assertions as excessively harsh and strict, especially in non-quite-certain matters, men are not drawn out of the mire of sin, but rather more deeply into it, because despairingly.

Wherefore, in practice, the Confessor (so far as it is possible) ought to be more benign than rigorous towards penitents. And therefore St. Gregory of Nazianzus said in his Oration 26: We exhort Priests to act leniently towards penitents, according to that which is written by the Apostle to the Galatians 6. Instructed in the spirit of leniencies. And Saint Bernard, in his Sermon on Saints Andrew concerning the Confessional, says: Let it be Chapter II. Dub.

V. From the Minister of this Sacrament. If you will have compassion and liberate him; and strive to detract something from severity, imitating the sweetness of your Lord. Saint Odilo, Abbot (according to Ribadiner, p. 2

on the first day of January) reproached for excessive benignity in administering the Sacrament of Penance, replied: Although I may be condemned, I yet prefer to be saved by divine mercy rather than be condemned through hardness of heart. B. Et si debet compati et liberare eum; et diligentius nitatur aliquid detrahere severitatis, imitantem dulcedinem Domini sui.

Humbertus Generalis PP. Praedicatorum in Glossa dixit, pluries impediri salutem animarum per nimiam austeritatem opinionum, sic loquens: Terruntur enim homines ex hoc tanto, ut negligant salutem; ideo relaxanda est quant potest austeritas et agendum benigne; quia sic melius trahuntur ad salutem cum sententiae mitiores tenentur. S. Bernardinus Senensis (super I Fer. II post Dominica). He wrote at the fiftieth line near the end: According to Scotus and Holsaten, when there are different laws and opinions, which nevertheless are not contrary to God and good morals (namely those that present some scandal or danger formally tending toward sin), all things being equal, the milder should be preferred. However, the statement is wisely made: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period should be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period should be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Confessor debet sequi benigniores sententias in delectu opinionum, quando illae potius inducunt poenitentem ad vitandum peccatum: secus vero, si ille potius conducant ad legis transgressionem, prout sunt (ut bene advertunt i n. 48 et 49.) opiniones illae, quae licet speculativè videantur probabiles, tamen in praxi sunt valde periculosae; congruent in materia sexti praecepti sunt opiniones aliquae de tactibus, osculis, choreis, coëmidiis, de reprimendis motibus sensualibus et simili-bus; item in materia simonice, et usurae, ubi plura video-runtur excusari ratione liberalitatis, sed in praxi magnum periculum involvunt; item quando agitur de compensatione facienda vel accusationem proae 98 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance: when dealing with offenders where there is an easy risk of injustice or vengeance. 66 « 3. Morally it should stand to him concerning the good disposition of the penitent, otherwise he will sin mortally by absolving the sinner * See what is said n. 459.* 4.

It is not permitted to absolve. 1. Who offers no matter: yet such is he who

shortly confesses after absolution what he had forgotten. *(Vide dicta n. 448. ubi oppositum tenuimus.) * 2. With whom it is possible to make reparation, he is not prepared to restore and to flee the proximate occasions of sinning. V. d. 32 sect. 2. 3.

One who is ignorant of those things which all are bound to know, for example, the ten commandments, and what pertains to fruitful confession and communion, ought therefore commonly to be instructed beforehand, or otherwise sent for instruction. *(V. the said law 2 from n. 3 in Praxis)* 5. Ordinarily, sinners are to be gently exhorted * (Ex cap. Omnis de Poenit. ubi dicitur: Sacerdos sit discretus diligenter inquirens et circumstantias peccatoris et pecchii. 'Item in Rit.' Romance is held: Si poenitens numerum et species et circumstantias peccatorum ex necessitate explicandi non expresserit, eum sacerdos prudenter interroget. But beware lest, through curious interrogations, you detain someone, especially a young person; if one is chosen as Confessor for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, suffices that, if one is chosen as Confessor for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, teaches integrity at least somewhat, even if it does not permit examination or instruction.

13 n. 10. Quâ scilicet auditis aliquis peccatis, absolvantur, cum onere redeundi ad confessionem pleniorem. * Sed hæc opinio videtur expressè damnata ab Inin. XI. Prop. 59. We note here moreover many things pertaining to the chapter Chapter II. Doubt.

We note here many things concerning the practice of Chapter II. Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament: 99 utilities, insofar as questioning penitent rustics. I. Rustici, qui putantur non satis examinati, communiter non sunt dimittendi ad se melius examinandum; ita cum Lugo Segneri (in suo Hinc recte ait Sporer n. 798. cum . et aliis passim, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. The confessor should ordinarily examine rustics; for although these are dismissed so that they may better prepare themselves, it is hardly ever that they will be made more prepared, indeed, rather they withdraw from the difficulty of conscience examination with ease and easily recoil from Confession.

II. There is no obligation to question those who appear sufficiently instructed and diligent in confessing their sins with their circumstances; . c. n. 23. III. A confessor should not be overly anxious in interrogating, but should inquire only about those matters which are probably suitable for the penitent according to his condition; as Salmeron with Alia states, as Suarez says, questioning will be burdensome for the penitent. IV.

It is better to examine individually each of those things which the penitent says, than to reserve all for the end, thus rightly with Lugo and Dicast. V. The penitentiary ought to beware lest it harshly apprehend the penitent while he confesses, so that frightened by a strong deterrence, he may conceal other sins; hence thus warns the Ritual: The penitentiary... having heard the confession, perceiving the magnitude of the sins... will apply appropriate corrections. Non tamen erit incongruum, si intrà Confessionem aliquando humaniter gravitatem criminum poenitenti exponat, dummodo illico animum ei praebeat ad reliqua confitendum. « 6. If the Confessor notes that the penitent lacks some necessary things required for this Sacrament, he is bound to instruct and admonish him according to the office; if he does not know those matters which are necessary through intermediate necessity for salvation, he ought to teach them; also, those who are obliged to lay aside hatred, to restore honor, fame, or goods, or to remove occasions of sin either by avoiding them or correcting them.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. Penances are to be prepared for scandal and other harms incurred, or for capturing delinquents, assisting them and counseling them, for denouncing crimes or delinquents prejudicial to the community or innocents: and finally, if they have incurred some censure, it is required of him to admonish about this matter and exhort them to satisfaction; and if they refuse, to withhold absolution, because otherwise he himself would become a participator in their crimes and an accursed sacrilegious person.

Refutation of Question 16, Article 12. Here take heed, for I say indeed that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood with odiousness and strictness from the election ordinarily made, not extraordinarily. For if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood with odiousness and strictness from the election ordinarily made, not extraordinarily. The Confessor is bound by a strict obligation of charity to dispose himself as far as he can, expounding upon the deformity of sin, the value of divine grace, the perils of

damnation, and similar matters, even though much time may be required for this. Nor should he care if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplement, provided that it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Other penitents should wait: for then the Confessor is not bound to attend to the good of others, but only to that of his penitent, for whom he will give an account to God alone at that time, not for others. « 7. He is bound to warn him who through an ineradicable and mortally culpable ignorance finds himself in a bad state, because otherwise neither himself nor the Sacrament will consult, when the penitent is indisposed.

Si vero ignorantia sit invincibilis, v.g. si bona fide teneat rem alienam, aut sit in matrimonio irrita, tenetur quidem monere et instruere, quando speratur fructus, nec timentur incommoda graviora: quae si prudenter metuantur, aut fructus non speretur, non tenetur, imo non potest. 22 n. 24. unless silence serves the common good, because it should procure the good of the penitent, consequently presumptuously it recommends, according to its own ignorance, Cap. II. Doubtful. V. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 101. he would work, for example.

Cajae, ut reddat debitum Titio, quem invincibiliter credit suum esse maritum, cum non sit. V. 2 de matrimoniis, dec. 38. Neque. Obstare, etiamsi sit in prejudicium tertii particularem, ait Lugo, et conf. 1. 2. c. 4. Hereby, if the Confessor anticipates that the penitent will not be absolved, if it is discovered that there is a nullity in the title which he believes himself to have, then such a nullity not to be demanded from him by one who has not been questioned by the Confessor.

If any confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary; but if the penitent himself doubteth and asketh, it is bounden to speak the truth, because silence would be an approval of error; yet prudently not more than asked, for example, if Titius asketh whether a marriage contracted after simple vow of continence be valid, and whether he may or must render the debt, let him answer. Thus, by remaining silent one does not acquire an

obligation to seek what is due. Vid, » » 8. When the confessors of princes, prelates; and other magnates know that they themselves do not satisfy their duty in office, for instance, regarding the distribution of benefices, the election of ministers, the governance of subordinates, or concerning alms given from ecclesiastical goods, etc., the confessor is regularly bound to admonish the penitent about his own obligation; otherwise, if he absolves, he imposes those sins upon his own shoulders, and leading the blind into blindness, both fall into the pit of hell. The reason is because in such cases there is rarely invincible ignorance; also, it rarely happens that they bring with them scandal to the subjects, who believe them permissible; or certainly do not bring common damage.

Si tamen videat ignorantium esse invincibilem neque ex illa sequi scandalum aut damnum commune: contrà admonitionem fore in majorem damnum poenitentis aut allaturam scandala vel incommoda potest secundùm paulò ante dicta dissimulare, nisi interrogetur. Ita Lugo d. 22 n. 37. 9. If a presumptuous penitent were held to be under sin » mortally, it would be allowed to something so exceedingly difficult that it could not then be believed as being accepted with equal mind, and vice versa better 102 Lib VI. Treatise.

IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. » he who is about to receive, a prudent Confessor might then leave him in good faith excusing himself from sin, and defer the admonition to a more opportune time, lest through fear of confession he abstain from it altogether, thereby incurring a graver loss. 22 s. 2 n. 27. » 10. Minus recte dispositus excitatus est ad dolorem, et propositum emendari, proposita peccati fœditi, bonitate et periculo damnationis, etc. Item remedia opportuna praescribenda contra peccata futura.

It is asked, whether the Confessor, foreseeing that admonition to the penitent will not be profitable, is at all bound to admonish him in any way? It is certain to be held, if ignorance is culpable, or is concerned with some medium necessary to salvation, otherwise the penitent would certainly be improperly disposed. Therefore, the doubt turns whether a warning should be given concerning other things which are not necessary for the medium, and when ignorance is considered inculpably? The first opinion affirms this, and Adrian holds to it. According to Wigandt, tractatus 2, nota 32. And likewise he holds this, page 6, nota 1758: if ignorance is concerning precepts of divine law, or according as it pertains to human law. The reasons for this proposition will be apparent from the objections to the second proposition.

Tamen secunda sententia communis et vera docet: si aliquis Confessarius

eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi; quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si poenitens laborat ignorantia inculpabili (sive sit juris humani, sive divini), et non speratur fru- tua; imo prudenter judicatur monitio fore magis ob-futura quam profutura: tunc Confessarius potest et tenetur eam omittere, relinquendo poenitentem in sua bona fide. Just as Busemb. . c. n. 4. with P. Soto, and Corduba, . 5 tr. 6 c. 13 n. 5. Sæbch. de Matr. lib. 2 d. 38 n. 1 et 10: Lugo d. 22 n. 24; Bon. de -Canus-rel. p. 5 cum Vasq et . 3 c. 4 § 1 . 344 n. 471. -. 8 art. 5 n. 4. Escob. 1. 16 n. 633. cum Henr. cum March. Chapter II.

Doubt. V. Of this Minister of the Sacrament—105 Croix 1.6 p. 3 n. 540. et cum Pontio, Aversa, : (at the Confessional) an impediment, and a wife to be left in good faith. The same is felt by Antoine (one of the more recent among rigorous authors) p. 534 qu. 3 where he says: If there is a probable danger, so that from the admonition might follow a formal sin of the penitent or a grave scandal, etc., the admonition is to be deferred and sought dispensation. They approve it: 1. from chapter [of Augustine] if anyone from this text really does not apply it to a particular case, for there S. Aug. speaks only of a sinner who wishes to defer penance until the end of his life, and thus he says: If I were to write you nothing that would profit you, I would not give you penance (that is, if I did not wish you harm). Likewise, if I knew that it would profit you (and that deferring penance) not to admonish and terrify you.

Therefore hold fast to what is certain, let go of what is uncertain. What therefore does this text refer to? They prebed from outside. Because regarding those who had contracted matrimony through a clandestine dispensation, if the Bishop is asked; You may keep silent when you see that a serious scandal will ensue from the separation. But this other text does not sufficiently prove even a presumption, since at least it is not certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be confirmed well by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary.

The Pope, thus responding, did not wish to dispense in that impediment (although Tournely... p. 317 understands there to be no interdicted dispensation there); all the more if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, should be

understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. That is to say, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Sometimes the Pontiff might presumptively dispense from the obligation to give new consent on account of urgent causes, as Clement XI did with certain Indian peoples on April 2, 1701, as Bened relates. XIV. Therefore rather our judgment is confirmed by the authority of D. Bernardi, who in Sermon 42 on Canticle says: I would rather sometimes have been silent and dissimulated, if someone were chosen as Confessor for supplement, it could well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood with odious strictness from ordinary election, not extraordinary, which at some point the Pontiff might presume to dispense from fulfilling anew the consent, as Clement XI did on April 2, 1701, concerning certain Indian people, as Benedict XIV reports. VI. Treatise.

Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. ciem. Therefore, the Holy Doctor refutes the warning: he has come to know that it would have been a greater downfall if he had concealed this, so that when a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, his confirmation can be properly secured through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary. For he has come to know that it would have been improper conduct. Above all, the opinion is confirmed by this most valid reason: namely, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be taken as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary. For, it is less permissible to allow the lesser evil that the greater might thereby be avoided; hence, in a confluence of material sin and formal sin, the formal one should rather be forewarned against if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be taken as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary. For, it is only God who punishes with punishment from sin alone when He regards Himself offended solely by formal sin. This reason will be more apparent from the responses to the objections which we shall soon consider.

It is objected from the first passage of Ezekiel (chapter 33, verse 8): "If I

say to the wicked: O wicked one, you shall surely die: You have not spoken that the wicked man may thereby be kept from his way; he will die in his iniquity. Yet the blood of him I shall require at your hand." But who does not see that this speech is directed against the one who is in a state of perdition, and whom the Confessor is bound to correct, so that he may repent? And thus are to be understood other texts of Scripture, and the Saints [do hold]. Fathers, who affirm the contrary. Objection is made against the second [position or statement].

The confessor is a doctor: therefore he is entirely bound by his office to instruct the ignorant and to make the law manifest. It is responded, if a Confessor shall be chosen as a supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, which if a Confessor is chosen for the sake of supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium following the period of the supplement, given that the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be regarded as odious and strict only for ordinary elections and not for supplementary ones. Confessarius non solum sit Doctor, sed praesumptum Medicus; unde ut Medicus, cum prævidet monitionem vergere in ruinam poenitentis, debet ab ea abstinere: et licet sit praesumptum Doctor, attamen, cum munus Confessarii sit munus charitatis, à Christo Dom. tantùm institutum in bonum animarum, debet quidem tradere doctrinam; sed illam tantùm, qua est proficua, non quam nociva est poenitentibus. Otherwise, if by virtue of his office as a teacher of all truth he were bound to instruct penitents, he ought to remove from them invincible ignorance even as regards matters of human law, though foreseeing a warning for some future occasion; but this either no one would say, or it would be said most improbably. Objection is made III. If any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict when referring to ordinary election, not extraordinary, should be understood in such a way that ignorance of penitents is not invincible butvincible; they approve thus: There is thenvincible ignorance when tosomeone either a doubt concerning a precept occurs or an open one is revealedin Chapter II.

Dub. V. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 165 according to the precept of learning; but here, now that ignorance is removed, see another way when the Confessor would be prepared to instruct if he had foreseen a future exhortation; therefore, the Confessor is bound to exhort such a penitent as laboriously suffers from an ignoble lack of knowledge. But it is replied: To

constitute avincible ignorance, not only is it required that there be a way to attain the truth of the precept, but absolutely it is required that there arise a doubt about the precept; otherwise, ignorance would always be invincible; for, as it is defined at 76a 2, invincible ignorance is that which cannot be overcome by diligence. Cum autem non occurrit dubitatio de aliquo praecepto, ignorantia studio superari certè non potest; quomodo enim quis adhibere studium potest ad inquirendum praeceptum, de quo per dubitandum nullam confusè notitiam habet?

Wherefore rightly does P. Segneri commonly suppose (in his work) that then indeed an invincible ignorance is present: When a person does not have any principle of doubt, and consequently does not have either any way of overcoming her error. Therefore, it must be concluded that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be firmly confirmed through another three years after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, should be understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For when there is no doubt concerning someone, ignorance is invincible: although by itself it belongs to the way of knowing some obligation, that nonetheless does not manifest itself to one who has no doubt about the obligation. Otherwise, if such a penitent were deemed to labor under avincible ignorance, it should be said that, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be confirmed well through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strictly to be understood in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, since it does not occur to someone without doubt that ignorance is invincible: although, per se speaking, there may be a way to know some obligation, yet it does not extend to him of whom no doubt occurs regarding the obligation. And even if he himself did not confess, and even if the penitent, after being admonished, repented, but the Confessor, on account of his ignorance or forgetfulness, failed to advert to admonish him, the penitent would still be condemned, because here he would be in bad faith, and in a formal sin, but this seems never to have been said by anyone. If a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election is, not extraordinary one, for when no doubt arises to anyone, ignorance be invincible: although there exists a way of knowing some obligation per se, it yet does not appear to him concerning whom no doubt regarding the obligation occurs. Otherwise, if such penitent should be deemed as laboring under vincible ignorance, he must say that, if a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement,

because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election is, not extraordinary one; but even should himself not confess it, or even though the penitent should be warned to repent, yet if the confessor through negligence or forgetfulness does not advert to admonish him, still the penitent would be condemned, because thus he would be in bad faith and in a formal sin; but this seems never to have been said by anyone. However, if the confessor advert to or not advert to making the warning, this has to do with chance for the penitent, whose knowledge and will alone depend on it; if a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election is, not extraordinary one; but even should himself not confess it, or even though the penitent should be warned to repent, yet if the confessor through negligence or forgetfulness does not advert to admonish him, still the penitent would be condemned, because thus he would be in bad faith and in a formal sin; but this seems never to have been said by anyone. Now however ignorance bevincible; or invincible. They object IV.

If a confessor be appointed for a supplement, it may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against appointing a confessor beyond a three-year period is regarded as ordinary and strict, not extraordinary; for if a penitent who is such were to be exhorted by the confessor's doctrine, he would have ten pounds. VI. Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance: the will is bound by a firm determination in error, hence as though irremissibly disposed, it cannot be absolved.

But it is replied and complained that what disposition in the penitent should be attended to so that his absolution may be denied? Whether an actual present indisposition or future one, or interpretative one, namely if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in ordinary election but not extraordinary, that if such a case should arise at this opportunity, he would sin? Not interpretative, otherwise many could not be absolved who now and here for some sin do not consider much of the denial of faith, but when persecution arrives, they would easily deny it. We must also say when speaking of Pergamus (of whose error the Church has condemned), if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in matters of ordinary

election, not extraordinary. For if such a case were placed there, he would sin? Not interpretatively, otherwise many would not be absolved who now and here think of multiple things against faith regarding some sin, but because persecution coming about they easily would deny that. Deus in poenam peccatorum futurorum non sinat aliquos infantes ad Baptismum pervenire, et ali- quos vehementer per- venire velit in praemium bonorum, quae operari essent si vixissent. Wherefore it should by no means be said, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; that, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus, if one were indisposed upon being admonished, he would not shun the Confessor; but if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Sed Confessarius non debet attendere ad indispositionem interpretativam quam paenitens habeat, sed ad actualem quam nunc habet.

Etideo, sicut non licet proximo exponere occasioni in qua positus ille succumbat, ita Confessarius, cum praevidet ex monitione ruinam penitentis, tenetur ab ea abstineere; esto penitens relinquendus sit in peccato materiali, et si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; unum peccatum formale omnibus praeponderet materialibus peccatis. 61. From these, it is inferred I. c. 5. Lugone n. 25. Habert, Antoine ll. cc. et aliis communiter (contra Concina m) si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si confessarius noverit pcenitentem invalide contraxisse Matrimonium ob aliquod impedi- mentum occultum et periculum sit infamiae, scana- dali, aut incontinentiae; si nullitatem manifestet, tunc debeat omittere moitionem et illum relinquere in bona fide donec obiacetur dispensatio. Nisi dispensatio (ut recte ajunt ll. cc.) de facili et statim obtineri possit ab habdute facultate et praesumptum ab Episcopo

(recte dict Palaus), ut liberetur pcenitens a peccato materiali. See mention Chapter II.

Dub. V. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 107 da de Matr. Whether, however, in the case of a contingency, the confessor can bind the spouse denying any debt regarding this? Bonaventura denies (saying that) it will be proper in a general sense to say that if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, his confirmation can well be completed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as regards ordinary election, but not extraordinary, obliges couples to render their debt.

They indeed more commonly and probably affirm Lugo and the doctors of Chartres, tractate 10, note 98. Croix 1. 6 p. 3 n. 542, et Escob. 1. 16 n. 630, cum Concilium. Henry. Reason, because being hindered by the persuasion of the spouse, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Marriage being valid, it is incumbent upon him to declare it, so that his own conscience may follow its dictate. What if Marriage should be contracted? For it is more to be prevented that the Sacrament be nullified than that a sin or the infamy of penance occur. But Sporer speaks thereon (and correctly so in the case where someone would wish to marry a consanguineous relative: firstly, because truly there is no infamy; secondly, because the penitent can easily recognize its nullity after Marriage and thus easily fall into formal sins; besides this danger of leaving illegitimate children, etc. On the contrary, at the end of 38 n. 7; and Lugo, d. 22 n. 24, absolutely say that in such a case the warning should still be omitted when it is considered with probability not to yield any fruit.

However, it seems more probable to me to say with Palao p. 18 § 2 n. 9, and because ignorance often ceases after such a marriage, and then there is easily a danger of formal sinning. Wherefore he speaks rightly when he says that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this

reason, Sporer says of illicit marriage that it should be omitted when there is a contract known to be unlikely to succeed. Si vero Confessarius certo moraliter desperet de fructu, tunc merito dict Lib. 108. VI. Treatise.

Chapter IV. From the Excuse Sin. Cross lib. 6 p. 3 n. 540, cum Aversa (quibus jam videtur adhaerere . et., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa strictaque accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria omittere debeat monitionem donec obtineat dispensationem quia melius est permittere peccatum materiale quam praebere occasionem certi peccati formalis. Neither hinders the reason of Holzmann, for (as they say in 1 num. 32) the sacraments do not demand more reverence than divine precepts. Wherefore, if material sin can be permitted in divine precepts, why should not material irreverence towards a Sacrament be permitted in such necessity that formal sin be avoided?

But this case, easy in happening and difficult in resolution, must be discussed. The question is put: what must be done if the spouses come to the Church to contract Matrimony, and one of them reveals a hidden impediment in the Confessional while everything is ready, and the Matrimony cannot be delayed without scandal and infamy? According to Gutiér, it should be advised that the one who has vowed chastity temporarily, for example for a month, dispense with it. lib. 2 d. 40 n. 8 tit. q. 3 p. 15 n. 6 cum Guttier. But this remedy, as they say on page 2 chapter 1 note 31, seems to be pernicious on account of the suspicion which it easily raises among others; all the more so if a Confessor is chosen for supplementing, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, by reason of its odiousness and strictness, more to be taken as applying to an ordinary than to an extraordinary election. Hence passim in casuists such a remedy shall be found prescribed: that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementing, his choice may well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementing, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, is to be taken more as applying to an ordinary than to an extraordinary election. Wherefore Lugo d. 22 n. 24 and the aforementioned Author and this agree commonly; but other Doctors very probably teach that in that case the Bishop can dispense; so Sanchez says. D. 40 n. 3 et 7. 3 c. 27 n. 4.

Cons. 33. 1. 6 c. 14 in fine, p. 50 n. 353. Concile de Jérusalem, tome 1, chapitre 9, note 6, page 3. Reply 80. Chapter Two. Dub. V.

Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 109 14 n. 11. . 6 art. 1 n.'8. . 500 n. 493

cum Bob. Fill. Master and Cross of . Molfes. . (who say that the moral judgment is rightly certain) and Pyrrho, ac Corrad. (who testify to how Sixtus V. declared it and calls it common [doctrine], Bened. XIV de Synod 1:7 c.31 n.2 (contra rigidissimum Fagnanum, qui in cap. Nimis, de Filii Presb., negat, etiamsi id optet ad legitimandam prolem in articulo mortis; adversus communem DD. cum) Ratio vel quia tunc praesumendus est Pontifex delegare Episcopo facultatem dispensandi, quam requisitus certè ei non denegaret; velquia ut ratiocinatur) Episcopus potest in sua Dioccesi quidquid potest Pontifex in tota Ecclesia, nisi aliquid Pontifex sibi reservavit (juxta id si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Plures dicunt de Dub. 1); unde si Episcopus dispensare nequeat in his impedimentis id ex eo provine, quia Pontifex reservat; sed cum reservatio fiat propter charitatem et ob bonam Reip. gubernationem non est verisimile pontificem dispensationem sibi reservare in casu tantae necessitatis quando aliter scandala vitari non possent hoc enim esset contra charitatem.

Therefore, in that case it is understood that the reservation ceases, and hence the Bishop can then exercise his ordinary power to dispense; this also conforms with other laws of pontifical authority, when access to the Pope is not possible. And in that case, probabiliter dicunt idem Sanchez n. 14. c. cum ac (Vicarius autem Episcopi ratione sui officii hanc facultatem certè non habet, prout notant .) Imò addit Pignatell. t, 3. Consult. 33 n. 5 ibidem 110 lib. VI. T ract.

IV. If for the sacrament of penance it has been proved that, if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict when understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary, then it should be considered that the law altogether ceases to apply where such a marriage is prohibited; for every law (as he says) is ordered to the public good, as is common among all according to c. 2 of Isidore: "It will be a just law, possible according to nature, suitable in time and place, useful, clear also." Hence when a law deviates perniciously, it certainly does not oblige, as he teaches in 2. qu. 120 art. 1 where it is said, if a confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict when understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Soto dicit idem; 3 p. 1 n. 4, qui probat cum et Salas, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia

prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi; quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Lex bono communi non conveniens, non sit lex, neque obligationem inducat. Andideo ait Pignatellus,tunc alium inferiorem legislatore posse declarare,si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento,bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementiquia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium,prout odiosa,stricta accipiendaestde electioneordinaria,non extraordinariacquod,sifalic Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento,bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementiquia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium,prout odiosa,stricta accipiendaestde electioneordinaria,non extraordinariaclex impedimenti cessetetnon obligetcum ine cuasu,sif aduc Pontifex velletlegem obli-gare,talis voluntas respiceretmalquia esset causa scandali. Wherefore it is said p. 2 n. 32 according to Jordano and Pignat., as above, that the prohibition against choosing a Confessor for more than three years should not be rejected as improbable and unsafe in practice, if such a Confessor chosen for supplementation can be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is understood to be odious and strict concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one., that, if ever even a presumptuous access to the Bishop should not be granted, and there was no other way to avoid the gravest danger of infamy or scandal, a Parochus or another Confessor might declare it, if such a Confessor chosen for supplementation can be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is understood to be odious and strict concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one., that, if such a Confessor chosen for supplementation can be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is understood to be odious and strict concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. In such a case, the law impediment will not oblige, since the same reasoning (as above) then applies, namely that if such a Confessor chosen for supplementation can be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is understood to be odious and strict concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one., that, if such a Confessor chosen for supplementation can be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three

years is understood to be odious and strict concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. The law will cease when it is rather harmful than useful.

And although here the end of the law does not cease in the general case, but only in the particular case, yet when nevertheless the end of the law ceases in the contrary direction, the presumptuous law ceases, as all agree; esto tunc permittatur contrahi Matrimonium, tamen quantocius (saltem ad majorem securitatem, et ad salvandam reverentiam legibus Ecclesiæ debitam) re- Cap. H. Dub. V. Regarding the minister of this penitentiary: he was bound to proceed to the Sacred Penitentiary, in order to obtain that dispensation. It is stated II. if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; for where no fruit is expected, there should not be presumed a warning of restoration, as they say 22 n. 26. 94 q. 4.

R. 2 Sporer de 8 art. 5 n. 5. . 344 n. 471 cum 1. 2 d. 38 n. 8 et 10 cum Cano, Henr. 1 de e. 12 n. 34 cum Vasq. Aversa, etc. (contra Concina m, Hab. 11. cc. et Antoine p. 534 qu. 3, qui duo ultimi in assignanda ratione circa monitionem de Matrimonio nullo, et de restitutione facienda, aperte sibi contradicunt). Ratio est, quia Confessarius, cum praevidet futurum, ut monendo de restitutione poenitens non pareat et in peccatum formale incidat, magis praecave debet sui spirituale damnum quam alterius temporale. Nevertheless they observe that it is not easily judged, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be received concerning ordinary election, not supplementary; for a penitent, knowing the truth, will not comply with the admonition. It is stated that III must be omitted as a presumed dismissal of the admonition when fears are entertained concerning the scandal of others, infamy, brawls, and similar matters; thus 32 sect. 4 n. 3. 38 n. 10. Lugo d. 22 n. 7. . 2 n. 8.

Reply 2 and 34 with the Dicastery and Granada. Because it is always more advantageous to avoid formal evils of others than the material sins of the penitent. It must nevertheless be received I when damage would accrue against the common good; for although the Confessor is bound primarily by reason of his office to attend to the good of the penitent, yet since he himself is a part of the Commonwealth and for the good of the Commonwealth, it may be otherwise. Chosen and constituted as a

Christian minister, he is bound to prefer the public good to the private good of the penitent; thus as Busenb. supra dixit, Lugo dicens die 22 n. 30. c. R. 1 37 cum Aversa, Dic. et aliis communiter. Hence, the parish priest must be severely admonished who, erroneously, even through invincible ignorance, instructed the populace regarding morals.

Likewise, worthy of censure is Article 14a of the Book. VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. He who in good faith thought himself a Priest when he was not, and through invalid sacraments would confer what is necessary therefor.

Likewise, ignorant of the nullity of Marriage, if there is a public rumor about it. Moreover, it is fittingly added by Lugo, d. 22, n. 3 (whose doctrine the Pontiff proposes as exceedingly beneficial to confessors to follow in the Bull to be shortly cited), that I should admonish the Bishops, Princes, Governors, Confessors, and similar individuals who through invincible ignorance perniciously proceed regarding the granting of benefices, election of ministers, supervision of subordinates, distribution of alms from surplus benefices, administration of the Sacrament of Penance, etc. The reason is that it rarely happens for such ignorance to be innocent or not harmful to others, who easily consider lawful what they observe superior officials to do. But N. SS. have rightly noticed. Pius XIV in his Bull Apostolica, edited on June 26, 1749 (in 86 Excipiendum II: if a penitent asks, then the Confessor is bound to reveal the truth, nor can he conceal it; because, since that person has already begun to labor under removable ignorance, the Confessor's dissimulation would be an approval of error; thus, section 32, chapter 4, notes 2 and 3). Lugo d. 22 n. 29.

D. 38 n. 14, qui excipit: si poenitens non interrogaret cum dubio, sed ex scrupulo; quia tunc (ut ait), dissimulante Confessario, illi praesumptum remaneret in bona fide. But this is not admitted by Lugo, and the aforementioned citation with Soto, because, given that an interrogation has been made, the penitent will later, at the authority of the confessor, if someone is chosen as confessor for supplementation, be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be understood in terms of ordinary election rather than extraordinary. And this is why, if someone is chosen as confessor for supplementation, he will be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be understood in terms of ordinary election rather than extraordinary. antea facie Cap. II. Mistake. V. On the Minister of this Sacrament. 115 times from ignorance.

Truly, however, Sanches n. 8 and Sporer II say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as pertaining to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, holds true; thus, when the penitent is questioned, the Confessor should not respond more than he himself is questioned, for instance, if someone obstructed by a vow of chastity asks whether Matrimony on account of that vow was made invalid, and whether his wife has the right to receive her due, the Confessor should affirm both, remaining silent regarding the obligation not to seek it, even though he knows that the Marriage is null because of some impediment. Excipiendum III if the penitent will soon be subject to brief admonition, although in the beginning he may not agree; thus wisely does he speak at the end: "The Confessor should consider how much and for how long discomfort from the admonition is feared; for it often happens that the penitent initially, troubled in mind, rejects the salutary admonition, but later, with his mind soothed, receives it with profit." Otherwise, as Lugo D. 22 n. 39 says with Adrian, Med. Cano, et Corduba, monendum esse poenitentem, etiamsi scandulum sit passurus; quando scandalum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. timetur, brevi mansurum putatur, et spes sit fore ut monitio postea brevi habeat effectum suum. But this place is better understood to be referred to according to what Benedict has transmitted. XIV. In praefata Bulla Apostolica, 1. c., causu quo, ut ait, dissimulante Confessario, peccator in pravo opere ob firmaretur cum scandalu aliorum; vel quando quis in proxima peccati occasione versatur; sive minus in exterioribus actibus, saltem in pravis cupitis et morosis delectationibus assentiri consuevit. Whether, however, it is to be considered as a matter for admonition in doubt, or whether it will be profitable or pernicious?

Resp. si non timetur de damno, omnino quidem fieri debet; si vero dubitatur tam de damno quàm de fructu secuto, tunc Confessarius pensare debet damnum et utile, item gradum timoris damni ac spei utilitatis, et eligere id, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta

accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Mala formalia potius evitanda sint quàm materialia. Here speaking, Lib. 114. VI. Treatise. Fourth.

On the Sacrament of Penance. P. Concina in the treatise on Eleemosynary matters (tract. de Eleēmos. c. 3 n. 9), writes, if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be duly confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year term, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which in case of doubt whether correction will be profitable or harmful, should be omitted, because (as if) imprudently acts he who leaves uncertain the matter to be acted upon. 617 « Resp. 2. That the Confessor licitly administer this Sacrament, he must be in grace; otherwise he will commit a mortal sin* (See what is said n. 31)*; likewise he should be such that through this he does not expose his neighbor to any risk of mortal sinning. The first part is evident from the aforementioned statements regarding the Sacraments in general. But when hearing many sins one after another as if in a single instance, some denied it, as Rod. others affirmed, as Bon. here states * (Vide dicta l. 5 n. 90 v.)*.

QUESTION 6 where this is entirely prevented (ne-gatur) * The latter part is evident. Whereby this case is resolved. The penitent is bound to confess to himself his mortal sin before he hears or at least absolves the penitent, himself admitting or being admitted regarding his own sin. (See what has been said in this book 6 n. 36). Si tamen vocatus impròviso ad moribundum recolligere se tam subito non possit ad contritionem eliciendam, vel bona fide putet se elicuisse, non peccat absolvendo. Prepose

Further on. Chapter 3, Section 2 * (See the aforementioned note 33.) Response 3. If he maliciously absolves by committing an essential defection, for example, if he has not brought forward the form or absolves reserved cases without subjection, he is bound to induce to a repetition of confession, if it be possible through his infamy, breach of seal, fracture of the sacrament, and harm; otherwise, if less, he is not bound. If he does not absolve from censure, he can (if he had such power) absolve the absent one [from it] * See the aforementioned discussion on this matter * Bonac. de Cens. in comm. d. 1 q. 3 p. 6 ex . If he did not sufficiently question the number, species, or other circumstances regularly for no purpose, then Cap. H.

Dub. V. On the Minister of this Sacrament: 115 - he is bound to do so only for the purpose of penance; he should admonish - for outside Confession there is no need, since the judgment has reached its conclusion. If however he returns to Confession—the penitent—he must be admonished concerning the fault committed; - for otherwise this confession will not be whole, since—some things have not been confessed due to proper cause. - I said if he did not inquire: because if positively stated, - it is not to be considered a confession of number, form, etc.; - he should be admonished, if without grievous scandal and detriment; - for there is a reason, if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary; which, if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed through an additional triennium following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be considered odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. another serious precept, - namely confessing those sins, which are violet. Lugo d. 22 - sect. 3. - Si neglexit monere de restitutione, moneat, si quidem commode potest, (vel in confessione) vel extra, obtenta prius ab ipsa venia; ea vero negata, ad nihil ultra tenèri docet. 3 c. 8. - Quia tenetur ex charitate: si non commode potest, Deo commendet. 5. t. 6 c. q. Hen.

Your Sylvius. Respone: 109. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning non-choosing of a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election rather than extraordinary, is to be understood. But if (on account of grave or mortal sin against the rights of another) he had said that he would not be bound to restitution, or by otherwise (e.g., persuading a false opinion), such would be an efficacious cause; why does he not restore, nor suffer some other harm to accrue to himself, or to others? He is obligated himself to restore it, unless he timely warns before the one who punishes becomes powerless, because his action was an unjust cause of damage. If however he did it without grave fault, nevertheless he is bound to admonish the penitent if this can conveniently be done: otherwise himself or another is under obligation in a corresponding previous case. If not conveniently possible, he will be excused. VIII. 8. d. 17.

R. 1. Lugo, d. 22, s. 3, n. - 6r et supra l. 3, t. 5, c. 2, d. 1, art. 2, cas. 12. Here it is necessary to distinguish several doubts which this point in time concerns. There is doubt I. To what end is the Confessor bound, if he has

erred regarding the value of the Sacrament?

If he has erred without fault, all agree that confession should not be insisted upon with serious inconvenience to reputation or honor; hence Lugo, d. 22, n. 58. 12, n. 56. Live and let live question eight article five note ten. Elbel p. 332 n. 437 and others frequently cited. Reason, because then the Confessor is bound only to a warning out of charity, which does not oblige when there is great inconvenience. This holds only for a delegated Confessor; otherwise it seems to be said concerning the Parochial priest, according to what is stated at 1.3 n.40v.

All: if anyone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if anyone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The parish priest is bound by justice to make good a great spiritual damage to the faithful. Recte autem addunt praefati AA., quemcumque Confessarium teneri monere poenitentem de nullitate absolutionis ei collatae, si ilesit in articulo mortis vel in gravi periculo non amplius confiten di. But what if the Confessor through a grave fault erred concerning the value of the Sacrament, is he then bound to admonish with his own great harm? The first opinion denies this, and Bonacca holds thus in question 7, page final, number 4. 32 seq. 6 and 7, with St. Anthony.

Sylv. . and probable opinion because, since congruent to the penitent it would not be required to incur such great harm in confessing his sins if counsel were given; thus neither should the Confessor. However, P. Suarez holds that if the Confessor has misled the penitent, he should leave him in a proximate occasion of sinning by neglecting to correct him. The second opinion, which we follow, affirms, and this is held by Lugo, ..., and Elb. ll. cc. item. If the Confessor has been deceived by the penitent's confession, by omitting him from the next occasion of sinning, P. Suarez objects that, although out of charity he had undertaken to hear the penitent's confession, nevertheless, after having heard it, he is bound both by duty and by quasi contract to minister the Sacrament properly to the penitent himself; hence, if through his own fault he has ministered it improperly, he is certainly presumed with grave damage to himself (even without petitioning for permission) to correct that error. Thus, the objection to the first reason is answered. The second response is also given if some

Confessor be chosen for supplementation, since it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary, not extraordinary election: thus, if some Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary, not extraordinary election. The penitent, if warned, could otherwise provide for himself outside of Confession by eliciting an act of contrition; but the Confessor cannot leave someone ignorant in such great damage lacking sacramental grace.

We have said, with sought-after permission. Dub. V. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 117 centia, for Conink, Bon., and .6 p. 2 n. 1785 say more probingly (against others) that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being as odious and strict as it is regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary, would then, if grave offense followed from a penitent's admonition, not hold for the Confessor at that time nor could he admonish, since the seal would be violated according to n. 622. Likewise it appears probable with the Authorities of the first Sentences, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict is to be understood of an ordinary election, not of an extraordinary one; that is, if a penitent be again confessed by another confessor, then the Confessor should not be held bound to admonish him gravely concerning the nullity of the first Confession.

Reason, because then already morally certainly the penitent is considered justified; and therefore, it is congruent that neither he nor the confessor is bound to incur great inconvenience in preserving the integrity of the Confession, so neither the confessor. And the same can be said if a penitent afterwards receives the Eucharist, because (as we have said concerning D. Thomas and others commonly), when the Eucharist is received with attrition and good faith, it fortuitously confers the first grace. Doubt is considered. What if the error was not concerning the value, but concerning the integrity of the Confession, namely, if the Confessor neglected to inquire about species and numbers of sins? Respondeant.

If the Confessor acted negatively in this matter by not asking questions, then he is not bound to advise about an error unless within the confession

itself, as Busenbacher says Lugo d. 22 n. 75. Even if the Confessor culpably neglected to ask questions. Reason, because the obligation of making complete confession directly affects the penitent and not the confessor; hence, although the confessor is bound to question the penitent about the species and number of sins during the confession in order to form a judgment concerning the state of the cause and of the penitent, this obligation ceases after such a judgment has been made in the confessional. Si vero ipse positivè induxit poenitentem, ne explicaret ille species sive numerum, tunc, si cum culpa gravi id fecerit, tenetur praesumptum extra Confessionem cum licentia poenitentis eum monere de errore, sed sine scandalo, et sine gravi suo damno; ut bene ajunlugo a. 73. et Sporer l. c., nam congruent grave damnum exsust poenitentem ab 18 Lib. VI. Treatise.

Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. with respect to the integrity of Confession, so presumptuous a Confessor. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessory beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood to apply to ordinary rather than extraordinary election; if, therefore, anyone should choose a confessor for the purpose of supplementation, it can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessory beyond three years is odiously and strictly to be received in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the confessor has not grievously sinned in this regard, much less reason would suffice for excusing him from giving admonition. Hence rightly they say at Lugo l.c., c. 8 n. 3: with Fil. ac si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Confessarius, qui bona fide de-obligavit penitentem ab explicanda specie sive numero, regulariter non teneatur admonere extra Confessionem, quia regulariter (dico semper) sine incommodo, et rubore id facere non potest.

What is the Confessor bound to do, if positively he has released or if he did not admonish the penitent regarding the necessity of making restitution? Response is given: if he positively dispensed with it through his own grave fault, all say that one should be bound to admonition, presumptuously with great discomfort, either within Confession, if the penitent soon returns to confess; or outside, by petitioning for permission, if he does not

return. Otherwise, if he did not admonish her, or after having been made penitent he was afterward rendered unable to admonish her, the confessor himself will be bound to restitution; in such a case (which is understood) where the penitent had already made restitution if she had been admonished. Ita communiter Lugo d. 22 n. 61.: . 233 n. 439. et cum Gran. Reason, because the confessor himself already became the cause of damage through his unjust counsel.

If, however, without guilt he dismissed a penitent who was grievously burdened, he is not bound henceforth to admonish him about restitution; but if conveniently he can do so, as they say with Aversa and co., because out of charity every one is bound to remedy grave damage to the neighbor even by a slight inconvenience. Nam autem Confessarius, si tunc omittat monere, cum possit sine gravi suo incommodo, teneatur ipse ad restitutionem? He denies that, according to lib. i. cap. 3. dub. 5. n. 2., if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can adequately be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is, as odious and strict as it is in the case of ordinary election, not applicable to extraordinary election; hence, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can adequately be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation. Confessor then is not bound at that time —Cap. II. Dub.

The confessor then did not have to— Cap. II. Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. 119 it is not out of justice to admonish when there is no positive cause of harm, but merely a negative one, namely, not manifesting to the penitent the known obligation; hence he is bound to admonish only out of charity, which does not obligate to restitution. And Cajetanus agrees with this opinion, v. Restitution cap. 7. at the end, where it is thus stated: If the confessor, having taught false things as true, is not held bound to leges justitiae. And the same [person] says: "Chapter 1. Generally and more correctly, N. 63 affirms this."

Sporer, Elber, cc., et cum Aversa, Dicast etc., item Ratio, quia, licet Confessarius sine culpa saltem gravi pœnitentem deobligaverit à restitutione debita, tamen, cum suum consilium pergat influere in damnum creditoris, cognito errore, tenetur ipse ex justitia causam damni auferre, si commode potest, alias obligatur restituere, prout hic et nunc ipse sit causa damni; prout si quis sine culpa gravi accendit ignem in segetem alienam, tenetur postea (si commode potest) ex justitia illum extinguere. See what is said in 1. 3. n. 994. Bene autem advertunt et quia consilium tunc solum influebat ex auctoritate Confessarii; unde revocato consilio cessat eius auctoritas influere. But what if the penitent was disposed to make

reparation at the time of Confession, had been admonished, and afterwards, with a changed mind, refused to restore what he could have restored upon receiving admonition? Antoine pag. 544. qu. 10.

R. 2. Dicendum est: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Tunc Confessarius ad nihil teneatur, quia tunc Confessarius sua monitione jam aufert causam damni, et ideò si pœnitens non restituit, id ex ejus malitia provenit. But most wisely, Lugo, n. 64, does not excuse the Confessor in that case from restitution: for reason, if he who authoritatively gives a wrong counsel should revoke it, thereafter he is bound to nothing more, as commonly teach the DCC 1.3 num. 559; yet this proceeds thus, according to the Rule of the Order. VI. Treatise. IV.

Do penance with regard to the sacrament when damage has not yet been incurred; but not when from deliberation damage has already been inflicted upon another. When however the Confessor positively and culpably releases the penitent from his disposition to restore, then he himself becomes the cause that damage is actually inflicted on the creditor, since otherwise, if he did not release him, the restoration would already be made in actuality. Wherefore, if damage has already been actually incurred, the confessor, even though afterwards he may seek to induce the penitent to make restitution, if he is refused, will not be excused from restitution, since he himself was the cause of the damage inflicted. This is if the Confessor positively impedes the restoration. If however he negligently abstained from warning the penitent about restitution, then it must be distinguished: If he has acted innocently in this regard, he is not bound to warn the penitent when it causes him considerable discomfort; but he is bound if, as we have said, charity obliges someone to remedy even a slight inconvenience for the sake of serious harm to one's neighbor.

And in this Lugo n. 63 notes that an inconvenience must be measured respectively with regard to the damage; if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since odious and strict as it should be for ordinary election, not extraordinary, if it is gravest, a probable obligation will probably arise to repair this with notable inconvenience. If however the Confessor culpably neglected to warn concerning restitution, they say Lugo, properly so, with greater inconvenience to himself he deserves to make the warning. An autem omitiendo hanc monitionem, teneatur ipse

restituere? If he omittes innocently, all agree that he is bound to nothing. But it is doubtful whether, if he omits negligently, he is bound to restore?

The first opinion absolutely affirms this, and this is held by the tract Tractatus 32, Caput 3, Quaestio 12, Numeral 79. Also, by P. Sayr. Middle Commentary 1, Question 2, Page 11, Number 15. Because (as they say), the confessor is bound ex officio to teach the penitent his obligation; otherwise, by not teaching, he himself becomes the cause of harm. The second opinion, which Jess. holds in his book 2 chapter 13 notes 77 and 78 and 3, considers that the confessor delegate is not bound: but the parish priest is bound because the latter by office is obligated to prevent harm from being inflicted by his subjects to others. The third however is the commonest opinion, which the chapter II states.

Doubt. V. On the Minister of this Sacrament. 121 hold [tenent] . 32 sect. 6 n. 9. 1 c. 6 n. 5. et 1. 2 c. 11 n. 23. Cabass. 1. 6 c. 13 n. 11. 4 c. 16q. 3. . 440. Croix n. 1781. with 1 R. 1 Bon. 1. c. with Sa, Valent. and Reg.

Lugo d. 22 n. 67. cum Concilium. Maldero, et communiter (ac probabilem ipse putat . c.), docet: Confessarium, sive delegatum sive Parochum, non teneri ad restitutionem. Reason, because the delegate is bound to admonition solely out of charity, which does not oblige him to restitution. The parochus, although he is constituted solely for the spiritual good of his subjects, is bound by his office to remedy their spiritual losses, but not the temporal losses of others. And I believe it should be more correctly stated (whatever Croix might confusely say in Book 1), even if the Confessor diligently neglects to warn the penitent so that he himself does not restore; because at that time still there is lacking a positive influx upon harm to others, which altogether demands the requirement of the obligation to restoration, as Croix himself confesses in Book 1, Chapter 3 paragraph 2 note 148. And it is commonly taught by the Doctors according to the aforementioned 1. 3 note 584.

Doubt is entertained IV. Whether or not the penitent may speak to the confessor outside of confession regarding a defect committed in confession without such permission? The first opinion stated, that he is not only able to do so, but is presumed capable, and this they guard. Section 33, chapter 5, note 3, and Fill. Croix n. 1776. et putat Escob. lib. 16 n. 675. et Ratio, quia talis monitio supplet atque perficit eamdem confessiónem incohátam, quam imperfecta mansérat; unde, etiamsi poénitens licentiam negáret, poterít confés-sarius ei manifestare defectum cum esset tum ille irrationabilíter invitus. The second, however, which I subscribe to, denies this, and they hold it. 1. 3 dist. 16 n. 3 Lugo, dist. 23 n. 130, who says that it is contrary to the common sense of Theologians, and that Croix

considers it more probable, II. cc. cum lib. 122.

VI. Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. Soto, Vict.

Fac. ibidem cum Sylvester. Aversa, Gab. Megala, nam si non absolverit, vel quia oblitus fuit absolutionis dare, vel quia eam male protulit, tunc valde probabiliter dict Croix dicitur num. 1776. cum Stoz et Arriaga bene posse Confessarium, non petitae licentiae dicere poenitentem, se illum non absolvisse; tunc enim vere nulla intervenit peccati ex. What? What and to what extent is the obligation of the Confessor to hear penitents? 63 « Resp. 1.

Whoever a priest presumptuously hears a simple penitent, when no one else is ready, is bound in extreme necessity, for instance, in the danger of death hearing and absolving one who wishes to confess; the reason is the law of charity. Response 2. Parochus et quivis Sacerdos curatus tenetur audire confessionem sui subditi, non tam in casu necessitatis aut præcepto confessionis urgenti, sed etiam saltèm per se vel alium quoties pœnitens id rationabiliter petit; v. gr. si sit in grave aliqua difficultate spirituali, vel velit promereri Jubileum, etc., quia tenetur ejus bonum spirituale promovere. If a confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is to be understood odiously and strictly in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary; even if once only or twice he had denied, deferred, or refused, it would not constitute grave sin on account of the levity of the matter, as it has been taught. If one does not petition out of urgent occasion, for instance, a solemn feast, etc. * (See what is said in this book 6 n. 58.) * Resp. 3. Whenever penitent wishes to confess out of mere devotion, the parish priest is bound to hear him, contrary to [the view] of Sylv.

Chapter II. Give. V. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 125 loc. cit. si non adsint alii Confessarii delegati et Parochus non legitimè impediatur. » Resp. 4.

The remaining priests, speaking generally, are not bound to hear confessions; yet if they have begun, they are bound to absolve, unless something prevents them, and they cannot refer it to another: because the penitent has that right to absolution in himself, neither can he deprive himself of the fruit nor the grace of the Sacrament. Objection. Locus citatus. Question is asked I. Whether the confessor is bound to absolve one lying in mortal sin and present with the danger of death, although he is

not the parish priest? The first opinion denies this, and Soto, Malder, and Sa defend it as well, according to Lugo d. 22 n. 12, who considers it probable.

Reason, because while the proximate person can absolutely be relieved from the danger of damnation by eliciting the act of contrition, he is not in such necessity that another be bound to assist him with risk to his own life. Limitat vero Coninch l.c., si talis infirmus sit in extrema necessitate, nempe si ignoret contritionem esse sibi necessariam vel nesciat eam eliciere: si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Reverà censeo in rudibus ut plurimum accidere. The second opinion, which more readily presents itself to me, asserts this and maintains it: 9 sectio 2 n. 3 et decidui 32 sectio 7 n. 1 Ratio, quia, si moribundus in rigore loquendi posset per contritionem sibi providere, tamen non potest negari; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary, quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary. magnopere periculi exponitur illi sui æternæ salutis si absque absolutione reliquat; et congruit cum certa damnatio proximi si non absolvetur teneris certam mortem subire; ita dicendum, cum proximus est in probabili periculo damnationis, teneri ei subvenire cum probabili periculo moriis ex lege charitatis quæ obligat in pari periculo exponere vitam temporalem ad salvandam vitam proximi spiritualem. Si tamen Sacerdos nesciat eum esse in mortali, non tenetur absolvere cum periculo vitae, ut dicunt Tolet et Rogatur II. Unus simplex sacerdos, qui dimoraverit in oppido, ubi talis esset penuria confessariorum ut incolae gravi laborarent necessitate spirituali, tutus sit in conscientia si negligat confessiones excipere vel cum possit ad eas excipiendas se habilem reddere?

Amongst no author treating of matters moral have I found this doubt discussed; save a certain little book has come to my hands, whose title is [Parroco di Villa p. 308], and whose doctrine and piety various other shorter works abundantly demonstrate; in which it is held: He who has talent for Confessing and sees within his own land the shortage of Confessions, knowing either that they do not frequent them or that they are harassed with them, and being bound to administer such Sacrament;

and if he be not of advanced age, he is bound in conscience to qualify himself as best he can. Idem auctor adducit auctorman Patris Pavonis Societatis IESU, vir doctissimi et pii, qui in suis scriptis ita locutus est: Obligatio est mihi sicut Sacerdoti ut obediam Praefectui meo, ubi commendant, si legitimum impedimentum non habeo; quia Praefectus potest commendare et ego nullam habeo rationem, cur talentum meum inopes loqui. Et praeterea obligatio est mihi, utme presentor ipsi Episcopo et postulo ab illo facultatem conferri, ut si populus meus sub graviori necessitate deficiat gratiae confessores, ego me offeram et ad concedeandam illi facultatem paratus steho. Breviscum loquar de hac re et quid sentiam. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood as applying to ordinary election, not to extraordinary; for if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood as applying to ordinary election, not to extraordinary. Priestly ministers be constituted by God, that they may attend to the salvation of souls; for it is congruous that the divine Father sent His Son, that the world might be saved through Him: so also Christ our Lord sent priests, that they might succeed in His Office and perform the mission on His behalf, as saith the Apostle 1 John 21.: Congruent est misit me Pater; ex quo mitto vos.

Therefore the Council... may verify the suitability [of those appointed]. The principal obligation of priests is to minister the Sacraments of the Eucharist and Penance, for this Chapter II. Doubt. V. Concerning the Minister of this Sacrament. For 185 by reason of sacrificing and absolving from sins, they are granted a double power.

But specially for this office of absolution Christ the Lord infused the Holy Spirit, as He Himself testified in the cited place, saying: He sent me forth from the Father, and I send you. When He had said this, he became pale, and said to them: Receive the Holy Spirit; whose sins you remit, they are remitted unto them; Therefore, since Christ sent Priests chiefly for saving souls, by absolving them from sins, it follows that this be the proper duty of the Priesthood, and consequently themselves to exercise their power even in a grave popular necessity, and to be able thus to serve, so that it may not be said, if any Confessor is elected as an addition, that he can properly be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is, according to its odiousness and strictness, received in regard

to ordinary election, not extraordinary; for those who receive the grace of God in vain (2 Cor. 6:13). Under these positions, I do not see how those priests whom necessity from this burden deprive can be safe in conscience, nor excused from the censure of the Lord and from the punishment of damnation inflicted on the idle servant who hid his talent, as is found in Mt. 25:18. This text (say the Interpreters, such as Cornelius à Lapide, Calmet, et Tirinus with S. Ambrose) properly explains about those who can take care of others' salvation themselves by their works, but neglect it from laziness or fear of sinning; for Christ Himself requests them in the day of judgment on account of this reason, "Note this," says Cornelius, "who have not used the ingenuity, doctrine, and high gifts given to them by God neither to take care of their own nor others' salvation, from laziness or dread of sin." Nor let such priests say that they have fulfilled their obligation sufficiently if they assist souls in other ways, namely by instructing, correcting, and praying for them; but they are bound to minister at the Sacrament of Penance, in which they themselves stand in need for their own salvation. If indeed the neighbor lacks food, you should provide him with food, and not clothing. Indeed, it has often happened in towns, that when someone is chosen as a supplement for confession, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary, many probably do not lack either instruction or admonition, since they may already be sufficiently instructed and prepared for confession, but there lacks the priest who will hear their confessions.

Neither does it hinder to say that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood with aversion, strictness, and severity in respect of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood with aversion, strictness, and severity in respect of ordinary election, not extraordinary. A simple priest, if bound to receive Confessions, would be bound only out of charity; but this is not forgotten with great disadvantage, as stated in the 126th chapter. VI. Treatise. IV.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance. The labor to be undertaken in order to acquire the necessary knowledge for receiving Confessions. For it is responded that if a Confessor is chosen as an addition, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the

addition, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted strictly regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary. Although the practice of receiving confessions is an act of charity, yet it does not arise solely from a motive of charity, but rather from the own Priestly Office, to which this obligation is annexed by Christ's institution, and the Priest ought to satisfy it when there is necessity in the people. These things seem to me worthy of being spoken with wiser judgment; therefore, I leave them for earnest consideration. ## DUBIUM. VI. What science and prudence is required in the confessional? Concerning the obligation to understand the sins of the penitent. Concerning the knowledge of the confessor for forming due judgment concerning sins. When shall the confessor be excused from threats as being suitable?

Do Regulars have to intervene with Congregations of cases of conscience? ibid. v. Note. 629 Regarding the prudence of the Confessor concerning questions; and regarding the obligation to question about omitted sins? If it is found that a sin has been committed, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. The penitent denies this, and what if he knows that from the confession of a co-sinner? 651 These matters are more carefully discussed. 632 Regarding questions about matters of chastity. Resp. 1. That the Priest may rightly absolve, he ought, whenever it is possible morally, to understand all the sins of penance, because otherwise he would vainly undertake to record. Whereupon the resolution follows: 1. He who absolves one whose sins he has not sufficiently understood through negligence, because he pronounces a sentence without knowledge of the cause, commits a sin.

It is nonetheless valid to give absolution, whether on account of sleep, or because of any impediment to speech or hearing (without however being culpable in this), if for some reason he has not understood, teaches also Item 5, Tertia 6, Caput 9, ex Henric. V. Chapter 2. If, however, after confession, the penitent comes to understand that one or more mortal sins were not correctly understood, he ought to repeat these in his next confession, either before the same confessor, or before another confessor. cc. 3. The penitent, being absolved by the confessor through ignorance, whom he could not rightfully absolve, commits twofold sin; namely, ignorance concerning those things which pertain to his office, and an undue absolution, Tann. in 1. 2 d 4 q. 9 d. » 1 n. 12. Lugo on the 16th day of the month, section 4, note 185.

» Resolution 2. In order for the Confessor to validly absolve, it is required and sufficient to recognize the sins, even if they are confused in reason as a result of sin. That he may truly legally absolve, it is required that he have such knowledge as to be able to render prudent judgment in this forum; hence he should know 1. what are mortal sins and what are venial, each according to its own genus. (Note here from Lugo of the 22nd day, n. 70: and it suffices if he knows how to judge this in those things which commonly occur; but for the rest, let him hear and absolve. Furthermore, it is taught that, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, because it is odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, allows that even if the Confessor in some case does not discern what sins are grave or light; if the penitent faithfully declares his sin with good faith, the confession suffices: and whatever is observed as having been mortal after advertence is not subject to repetition in another Confession. *2. Species, et circumstantiae necessariæ explicandas. 3.

Looking to the restoration of goods and reputation. 4. Cases opened and at least more common excommunications. » 5. Censures, and more common irregularities, for 128 Lib. VI.

Treatise. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. Priests. 6. Required in the penitent for a good disposition. 7.

Suitable remedies for sins. Cir-cà quæ omnia notantur hæc tria. Firstly, suffice it if she knows these matters mediocritely enough that she prudently doubts about all things and consults with the wise or the books. * (Better is said in Psalm de Pœn. c. 12. n. 7. according to .) * Secondly, demand greater and lesser knowledge, and suffice scientific knowledge, for the diversity of places and penitents. q. 7. p. 2. §. 2. » Thirdly, severely to sin both him who undertakes such a task without sufficient knowledge; and him who constitutes such a person without necessity, or who, when able to correct it, permits it. . 5. cap. 13. Good.

1. c. Lugo. However, the Confessor is excused if he lacks sufficient knowledge, provided necessity requires it, namely, if those who ought to confess should otherwise remain a long time without confession, as happens with captives; so Lugo, d. 22, n. 74 and n. 12. And likewise Aversa in the chapter on small towns or triremes, where (as they say), if learned priests cannot be had, less learned ones may be appointed instead, which can be done. However, those who are to be admonished are under

an obligation to learn. Moreover, those who command to receive Confessions are not easily persuaded otherwise if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, since it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be accepted in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary. For such a task they must become sufficiently prepared without prolonged study of moral science; for which reason it is insufficient merely to glance through some Summae that pertain to these matters; nor is it enough to know general principles of this faculty, as certain arrogant ones (disdainful casuists) assume the name of the letter of the law for themselves. Moral science is indeed not only very necessary for the Christian commonwealth, since from it depends the good governance of souls; but furthermore, it is extremely difficult: both because it requires a general knowledge of all matters, and Chapter II: Doubts.

VI. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 129 other sciences, offices, and arts; because it comprehends in itself many diverse matters that are mutually separate; because in most part it is composed of so many positive laws which are found only among the casuists, especially among the recent ones, continually increasing each day; moreover, it has escaped from difficulty on account of its intricate circumstances, out of which depends the variation of solution: for different principles must be applied according to the diversity of circumstances; and in this lies the difficulty, since it cannot be done without much discussion or careful reading of many books; these things being examined and made clear. Obiter notandum hic est: si quis Confessarius pro supplemento eligatur, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi; quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa et stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. The bishop is not able to coerce regular confessors to intervene in Congregations of Cases of Conscience, according to Declar. The Sacred Congregation concerning which P. Zacharia speaks in Croix; but against it is the decree.

S. C. Discipline respecting the Superiors of the Regulars given on the 8th. November 1751 and approved by Benedict XIV. See the appendix attached at the end of Volume IV. The aforementioned Bull of Benedict XIV., towards the end of page 21, wherein it was provided that in all Conventions of Regulars, in which Confessors have been approved by the Bishop, absolute Reading and discussion of cases of conscience shall be made according to the Decrees of Clement VIII; and if discussion is not held, then said Confessors are bound to attend the discussion of cases of conscience as ordained by the Bishop. Moreover, if the penitent perceives that the priest has not sufficiently expiated the gravity of a mortal sin, it is

incumbent upon him to admonish the penitent: 'I have sinned mortally.' » 2.

Qui socias prudens confitetur ei, quem scit suam conscientiam dijadicare non posse, tenetur confessioneum repetere apud peritiorum: quia graviter peccavit sic confidens. Resp. 3. Prudence is required both in instruction, 69 monition, care of the penitent, and in questioning. And indeed, if he judgeth prudently, then the confession will be entirely integrated, for instance because being well instructed he can and customarily useth due diligence. (Felixquia deducatur a . 130 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. He who has confessed briefly is not bound to be questioned on anything; otherwise he would be bound, as the common (authority) holds (15 R. 7 ex negat esse peccatum mortale non examinare aliquam circumstantiam ex oblivione).

See the supposed C. de Lugo d. 22.): quia tamquam judex debet curare integritatem judicii, et tamquam medicus ut morbi et vulnera perfecte detegantur; cavendo interim 1. Let there not be a curious examination regarding non-necessaries, lest the confession of the Confessors, the dignity of the Sacrament, and the poena of the penitent be diminished. 2. Let it not be indiscreet, for instance, concerning those things which morally are known as rarely being committed by such individuals, or from which a penitent might learn to sin, or about matters in an indecent manner if from the words it can be probatively estimated. Let it not be inopportune, and let there not be allowed to be explained first as much as possible, so that it may not terrify through its importunity. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding an ordinary election rather than an extraordinary one.

However, some warn to expedite so that the penitent is not interrupted between the confident one, and it is universally not approved by C. de Lugo, chapter 22, note 15: especially if confession is not brief, because easily something escapes from memory. * (See n. 607 in fin.) * Hence resolved. » 1. If the Priest brings forth a penitent, presumptuously after sufficient contrition, which, for some sin, or necessary circumstance, to omit would be more probable and truer, per se speaking, it is better to hold questioning; even though he denies Sa, v. Confessor, et 7 n. 3 videtur dicere esse probabile: verum alii rejiciunt. Even if he denies it, Sa, v.

C. de Lugo d. 22. * (And rightly do they reject it, so as to hold in

accordance with the common opinion, which is taught in sect. 3 n. 7. q. 5 et) * Cap. II. Doubt. VI. Of the Minister of this Sacrament. 1 5 i » 2. Even though a Confessor is clearly known concerning the penitent's sins, if another Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict when referring to ordinary elections rather than extraordinary ones, should hold. Nevertheless, he himself denies that he ought to absolve him; but if from some other relation or suspicion, it is held thus, then standing in the penitent's confession, with respect both for those who believe in his favor as well as against him (section 32).

In however both said cases prudente confessario est. Caute, et à longé, tum propius interrogare. 2. If however he denies, prudently judge whether he was unable to forget, or whether he has confessed to another, or whether he deemed it not to be a sin, or for some similar reason excused himself, in such a way that he should be absolved. c. ex Sylv., because of the danger of indirect revelation, or even if he has given consent, on account of the danger of scandal. V. Laym cap. 14.

Diligen: this law is to be observed; what a penitent, concerning whom he knows or suspects some sin, should do when a confessor is chosen for supplement, can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a confessor is chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. That one does not confess? » It must be distinguished if he knows outside Confession and has knowledge thereof from his own science, for example, by seeing a robber or by hearing blasphemy without doubt he ought not to absolve if that person denies it; except that prudence may lack whether another had been confessed to him or whether he has just cause to remain silent; thus generally all agree with Busen. d. 52 sect. 3 n. g. Lugo d. 22 n. 21 n. 23. Sporer n. 802. , 8 ar. 5 n. 2. et alii passim.

If indeed a Confessor has it on account of suspicion, or from another person’s relation, it is commonly supposed to be presumed. Which, if a Confessor should be chosen for supplementation, could well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be received with severity

regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary. For if that person has forgotten the sin or confessed to someone else, or if a Confessor should be chosen for supplementation, could well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be received with severity regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary. For he may have just cause to keep silent; 135 Lib. IV: Tract. IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. or having referred them elsewhere; because in this forum (let all of them do so. D. Thomas: Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. (lib. 1. art. 12) omnino poenitenti credendum est tam pro se, quam contra se.

But it does not seem alien to reason if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, and may fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be strictly received in ordinary election, not extraordinary, that which, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, may fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be strictly received in ordinary election, not extraordinary. If a Confessor should have knowledge of some other's sin through certain relation from others; then he cannot absolve the penitent denying it: truly if these crimes were referred to me by such grave witnesses who would render moral certainty thereof, and I was otherwise certained from another part, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, may fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be strictly received in ordinary election, not extraordinary. That penitent cannot have forgotten it, nor any reason for silence; I would not dare give such an absolution against rule: for that rule must be believed by the penitent, speaking indeed of dubious matters, but not rather of matters morally certain; for moral certainty is truly genuine certainty. Si autem Confessarius noverit peccatum ex Con- fessione alterius; tunc utique non poterit specialiter poenitentem de illo interrogare, nisi expressam ab illo altero licentiam habeat, sed tantùm poterit generalìter interrogare; et hoc dico, ne Confessarius sit nimius in interrogatiòribus repetendis, quia in hoc praesumptum esset periculum revelationìbus. It is commonly said; and Nave also says not improbable, v. 21 with Sylv. and with Holzmi. II. cit. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus

supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si aliquod peccatum sit commune talibus personis, possit de eo specialiter interrogare, prout in sponsis communè est probabile in tactus inhonestos, vel saltem in pravas cogitationes. Et autem possit Confessarius esse, quem complexus confitens negat peccatum, eum absolvere?

He affirmed to be able and obliged, according to Lugo, dicta n. 21.42 cum 11 R. 21.14 h. 44. He censures as obliged to absolve under condition: But with my own judgment he feels Croix n. 1699 citing: and Illustrious ones, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can certainly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is understood in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one; which, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can certainly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is understood in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one. In that case he absolutely never absolves, but only adjures to the concealment of the desire for absolution. And to this adheres: Vivà in the aforementioned place says, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can indeed be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not supplementary; that is to say, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can indeed be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not supplementary. With Chapter III. Dub. I. On Accessories of Penance. 333 The confessor prudently judges; he who sacrilegiously denies the penitent a sin, should not absolve her. « 3.

Interrogations concerning matters of casuistry ought to be few, prudent, and cautious, so as neither to afford an occasion for investigation, or for conveying knowledge, nor to teach, offend, or expose oneself or another to danger. And if he fears this, it is rather that something should be lacking to the material integrity. And indeed, if in this matter thoughts are denied, there is no need to proceed to works; yet those who deny thoughts confess words and perform deeds: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, does not equally recognize or observe

those [thoughts]. Vide 7. Fagand. praec. 4 lib. 4 cap. a. 3 tom. 4.

Response 99. » HEAD III. CONCERNING THE ATTACHMENTS OF PENANCE. DOUBT I. What is the seal of Confession, and to what does it bind? Is it permissible to employ an approved opinion in this matter regarding the seal? How should the seal be preserved? How many sins does one commit by violating the seal? There is no obligation of the seal from a fictitious confession, nor from a secret communicated outside of Confession.

What if the penitent shall have withdrawn in a state of indisposition? II. What in doubt, if he said something within or in relation to Confession? 638 In which cases is the seal not broken? 639 Can and must the confessor give the penitent who has not been absolved a certificate of confession made, or of accepted absolution? 640 Under what circumstances does the seal fall? Cadunt. I.

Let presumptuous penance come as a venial sin. II. Peccata compliciis. Is it permitted to inquire about a complicit partner? (Remission at no. 401.) 641. Dub. 154 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. 1. May one admonish a complicit penitent on account of the penitent's license?

Question 2. How does a presumptively objected matter fall under the seal? III. Penance imposed is annulled. IV.

The circumstances of sinners fall. Do the virtues and revelations fall? Do the natural defects of the penitent fall? What if such defects are patent by themselves, namely, if the penitent be lame, deaf, etc.? What if he be scrupulous? And what if the Confessor opposes within the Confession that the penitent is deaf? Those who are bound to the seal? Let it be bound by secrecy, I. Confessarius. How is the Confessor to respond if asked whether he has heard any sin or whether he has absolved? II.

Above [authority] requested for the reservation of permission for the reserved sin. III. Interpretation. IV. He who hears a Confession secretly, or accidentally, or out of necessity, for example, during shipwreck, etc., V.

Est peccatum cui sacrilegium revelatum est. VI. Confessor fictitious. VII. Doctor consulted.

Eighth. Scriptor Confessionis. IX, reading the written confession. X.

According to some, the presumptuous penitent is discussed more thoroughly, though improbably, in a detailed examination of question I, 648.

Whether the confessor is bound to a consuler doctor to demand from the penitent a seal of permission to grant absolution? 649 Qu. II. Is he bound who is consulted by the penitent for permission to confess? III. Who is bound to read another's Confession written? 651 How ought the permission to speak to be granted by the penitent?

It must be the first. Expressa. II. Free. III.

Not revoked. IV. It suffices, if it be given by voice. V. Either if it is given through an action, namely when the penitent begins to speak. Can the confessor immediately after absolution discuss sins with the penitent?

Can a confessor advise a penitent on an error committed in the Confession? Can he speak within the Confession about what has been heard about other matters? Can the confessor break the seal by saying that he has heard such a sin in some place? Doubt. I. A purple seal manifesting the sins of some place? Doubt.

II. What, if it is said, that a Religiosum of some Conventus or Order has committed such a sin? May the Notitia of Confession be used for external governance? See what is found among Busemb. 656 Dub. I. Whether the confessor, on account of a sin vehemently committed by his penitent, can remove him from the office? 657 Dub.

II. The Confessor, upon hearing a sin from his penitent, may be able to remove him from the duty? May he refuse his suffrage to him whom he knows from the Confession to be unworthy? And whether it can be used for this purpose according to Cap. III. Dub. I.

Of the Accessories of Penance. 155 for some pretext? Whether the confessor can use the knowledge of confession to protect his own matters, or with greater diligence to oversee, or for other purposes? Dub. III. Whether it can deny Communion, or Ordination, or assistance in Marriage to a penitent without absolution being remitted? 659 Dub. IV.

Can one make use of the knowledge of Confession to guard oneself against the plots prepared against him? Whether a penitent can conceal himself, him whom through Confession others usually recognize as guilty of many crimes, even though others do not notice the celebration? And can an

indisposed penitent flee away from him whom the ministra terrifies, if he does not absolve? 660 Dub. V. Can it celebrate in the Church which it knows to be polluted from the Confession?

Doubt. VI Whether you should lead him to confess, whom you know from Confession not to be a penitent? A confessor is not bound to beware of any trifling suspicions of others. Above all, for the elucidation of the questions which are set forth below, it is to be seen whether in this matter of sacramental seal it is permissible to use opinions derived from probable reasons. La Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 1945. ex Diana, Gobat et Stoz, citatis præced. n. 1945. tantùm dict expedire, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. sequamur sententias faventes sigillo. But rather, according to I n. 32., it is taught that there is no obligation to make reparation to the Sacraments, as with other divine precepts more probable than probable; because otherwise a burdensome penance for the reconciliation would be imposed, if some Confessor were chosen for the supplement, and could sufficiently be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is to be strictly interpreted as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary.

The confession would be odious to him. And verily this reason presses hard; for as it has been said in lib. 1 n. 33, it is not lawful to resort to a probable opinion at the prejudice of a certain right, if a penitent can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is strictly and odiously understood in matters ordinary, not in matters extraordinary; for if a Confessor is chosen for the purpose of supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict, is to be understood in matters ordinary, not in matters extraordinary. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV.

On the Sacrament of Penance. - let its own burden of Confession be lightened for anyone. What-ever, therefore, I may have said elsewhere after careful perusal, I think that here absolutely it must be said: it is not permissible to incur any penitential burden from opinions whose use does not admit of certainty in a moral sense. 634 « Resp. I. Sione sua confessionis ullumpatiatur gravamen. This seal is the obligation of divine law » strictly in every case, presuming that the integrity of the kingdom »

might be endangered thereby, for the sake of silence, presuming that after death would pertain something, dictated in confession (that is to say, in an order for sacramental absolution) all that revelation of the Sacrament would make onerous, » or odious. This seal is the strictest obligation of divine law in every case, presuming that the integrity of the kingdom's salvation would be endangered by revealing it in confession (that is, in the order for sacramental absolution), all things which revelation of the Sacrament would make onerous or odious.

The violation of this seal has double malice, sacrilege against the due reverence of the sacrament, and injustice, from the virtual pact between the penitent and the confessor, to keep this secret in all cases. Dian p. 5 t. 11 R. 2. ex R. 8. ex Malder. item detractionis, si non sit peccatum publicum. Ita Sporer, ..., 636:2. This obligation is not induced. Through confession falsely made: for example, to steal, to lie, or to pervert a priest (or to deceive), even though this case is still prudently kept silent.

See [It is common] with [others and similarly elsewhere]. If anyone receives something outside confession under the seal of confession; because there is only a natural obligation to secrecy, either more binding or less so according to the exigency of the matter * (I.à praesumptum c. ac cum Innoc. Whole city. If anyone receives anything outside of confession under the "seal of confession"; because there is a natural obligation to secrecy, either more gravely or less, according to the necessity of the matter * (I.à praesumptum c. ac cum Innoc. Panorm.).

Caj. Soto, and communi.) * Cap. III. Doubt. I. On Accessories of Penitence. 157 If born: I.

If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one; for if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one. The confessor was bound by secrecy, even though the penitent, being indisposed, should depart; provided that he has declared his sins for the purpose of absolution; so says S. Thomas in 4; D. 21 q. 3 ar. 1 ad 1. Lugo d. 23 n. 45. . 99 qu. 2. Sporer n. 809. etc. num. 15. ex communi. Notandum II.

If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Even still in doubt whether something has been said concerning penance in regard to Confession, the confessor was bound to the seal. Suarez, et alii, apud 6 p. 2 n. 4. cum Reg. Graff. . 320 quæst. 6. Mazzotta page 582. Croix n. 1046 cum Regin. et Schilder. contra Baldi, Ratio, quia aliam redderetur odiosa Confessio, dum alioquin plura peccata re vera in confessione auditae possent impune manifestari propter defectum memoriae et hallucinationem confessarii.

3. The seal is not broken. I. If in general you say that Titius has confessed to you venial faults or as being blameworthy, innocent, but not in those circumstances from which it could be gathered that others were culpable or confessed mortal sins. 2. If you say that N. has confessed to you, although in certain circumstances it would also be perilous, yet if a penitent by word or deed (for example, by approaching publicly) signifies this; and if anyone wishes not to be known, then it can be well confirmed through another three years after the supplement time, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is, in its odiousness and strict interpretation, applicable to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Therefore, if a confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three years following the supplement period, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years should be understood as applying to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. The confessors wish to reveal the seal of confession.

Navar. et Resol. 47. * (Et rectè consentiunt Sporer n. 825 et)* Quia pænitens confitendo Confessario extraordinario extra venirét in suspicionem gravioris criminis, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. c. 3. dubiè confirmat; asse rens, se vereri, ne talis accedat ad fractionem sii gi li. III. If thou referreth sins in such a manner that, morally speaking, a person cannot be known thereby; neither can any community take up an undue presumption, as if by selecting a Confessor for supplementation, it could be well confirmed through another three years after the time of

supplementation, because the prohibition against not selecting a Confessory beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received regarding ordinary election, not supplementary election. For by selecting a Confessor for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not selecting a Confessory beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received regarding ordinary election, not supplementary election. If Italian vices reign. V. . 2 tract. 15.

Resolved. 13. That would be contrary to the seal, * (See below note » 653.)*. Hence, according to book 138, chapter 1. VI. Tract. Four.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. R. 45 et c. 3 reprehendunt superiorem locum, qui Provinciali fortè dicat, in sua domo sæpè postulari licentiam absolvendi à reservatis: quia potest redundare in ignominiam et damnum domus; etsi idem le esse, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Non sit contra sigillum si dictae licentiae petitæ fuerint extra Confessionem. IV. non sit contra sigillum, si dictae licentiae petitæ fuerint extra Confessionem. If you make use of notice acquired outside confession, even if it were a sin, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict to be understood in ordinary election, not extraordinary, should not be contrary to the seal, even if such licenses were sought outside confession. Otherwise, you have become aware of something else, open it, but only without regard to any circumstance from mere confession; nor can you trust it as coming from outside confession, where great caution is needed and it is safest to remain silent. "4."

When several, for example, scholars or courtiers, etc., are bound to bear witness to the confession, the confessor is taught to give them that testimony, presumptuously instructing those whom he has not remitted. 15. It teaches presumptuous ones, whom it has not absolved, to hold and give witness to the confession, the Confession to provide this, is commanded. R. 22 tum ne id negando prodat aliquo modo sigillum et poenitentem; tum quia dando non men- titur, cum tantùm testetur, e confessum. However Bon. d. 5 q. 6 p. 4 et Card. de Lugo d. 23 s. 4 don-

cent, tali schedam negare non esse contra sigillum (Idemque concede- rit 3 si non constet poenitentem accessisse ad hunc Confessarium; tum quia nihil dict. sed tantùm non approbat testimonio- nium positivum confessionem, ad si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemen to, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus suppli- menti, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus suppli- menti, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Nec quidquòm facit ex quo possint cognosci delicta poenitentis; tum quia alias via aperiretur fraudibus, et multi improbi Parochos in Paschate deficerent; tum quia potest esse consuetudo ut scribatur ab- solutum esse si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus suppli- menti, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si scribat et si omittat sigillum franget; tum quia scandalosum erit et iniquum publicæ meretrici perseveranti (uti et occulto peccatori sic pallianti suam iniqua- talem) testimonium dare confessionis; neque Confessario imputandum erit si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus suppli- menti, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, It is more probable and common that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, his confession might be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed, concerns ordinary election, not extraordinary. If, however, a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, his confession might be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed, concerns ordinary election, not extraordinary. If anything be written in the schedule, that only a penitent has been confessed, Chapter III.

Dub. I. Of the Accessories of Penance. 139 - the schedule ought to be conceded; as the Author of the Office holds. Sporer from 492. Cross n. 1994 et hoc est contra 5 p. 4 n. 7 qui ait negandam esse; - et contra Lugo D. 23 n. 87 qui cum Henricus dicit posse negari, quia licet confessarius non possit revelare peccatum, non tenetur tamen testimonio positivo illius confessionem approbare.

But I do not acquiesce to this reason, because, whether or not he be bound

to cooperate in the approbation of that Confession, he is nevertheless bound to avoid indirect revelation, which cannot be avoided if the schedule is negated. But otherwise, if the Confessor should be obliged to write on the schedule that the penitent is not only confessed but also presumed absolved; because, since lying is intrinsically evil, it can never be communicated, as commonly they teach the Doctors of the Church. Lugo d. 23 n. 87. with Croix, Sporer, p. 11, c. 11. Si tamen schedulae essent jam typis edite, quibus asseritur absolutio impertita, videtur probabile (ut aliquirentiores dicunt) tradiri posse confessis non absolutis, saltem si publice petant, quia tunc Confessarius nullum profert, aut scribit mendacium, sed tantum material actum operatur, tradendo hanc schedulam: » 5. Under the seal fall I. all sins poenitent 640 » confessed, both future and past (if indeed this animo se accusandi sint manifestata; secus si per modum simplicis narrationis, vel ut Confessarium ad simile peccatum induceret. R. 25 ex .) Ideòque peccat mortali, qui sive directè sive indirectè aperit aliquod veniale in particulari, etiam leve Titii; quia materia sigilli parvitatem non habet; ut est omnium ferè sententa apud R. 8 et Tamb, in append.

Accordingly, if the Confessor says that the penitent confessed a venial matter as having been punished, but did not confess more; it is nevertheless light venial matter because the seal of sacraments does not have any insignificance; this is generally accepted by R. 8 and Tamb in appendix. VI. Treatise. Chapter IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance.

Veniatia; Sporer n. 830. . 706 et 22 cum. etc) * or who in general doubts, him to himself confesses to be some mortal sin, or reserved case, or excommunication, or not to have been absolved by indisposition. But rather the Confessor who says "absolutely, I have not absolved Peter," to break the seal according to R. 42 ex Suarez, and others. II. Presumed sins of a complicitor, whether prudently, or wisely, or imprudently spoken, R. 111. But is it permitted to question a complicit party with the intention of correcting him, those who affirm that such can be done on account of the penitent's license?

Card. de Lugo d. 16 n. 426 ubi docet posse aliquan- dum pœnitentem à Confessario obligari et cogi ad mani-festandum complicem extra confessionem. *(On this, see entirely the remarks no. 491.*) 64. Dubium. 1. Can a confessor advise a complicit party about the license of penance? The first opinion (but not sufficiently probable) denies it; and this is held by them. When Vasquez, likewise Soto, Palud. 11 R. 14.

The first reason is because this would be presumptuous against the seal; for presumptuously committed sins of a accomplice fall under the seal. The

second reason is that otherwise the Confession would be rendered odious to others, even though it is not directed at penitents. The second, however, is the common opinion and the true one, which D. Thomas affirms in Opusc. 12 qu. 6, where he teaches that it is not permissible to reveal in Confession the identity of a Complicator, unless the order of fraternal correction is saved. Therefore, by the permission of the penitent, the confessor can correct the complicit. Item S. §, 11. . 34. seot. 4 n. 4 Lugo d. 23 n. 138.

Diana loco citato et Croix ibidem cum Adr. He who hesitates. Reason, because from the confession of another accomplice no right is acquired to the sacramental seal: for this seal has been offended solely in favor of penitents; hence it follows the nature of other Sacraments by which a right of secrecy is acquired only to him who commits that. And thus, consonant with this reasoning, only the penitent can place the seal, and in this way he alone can also remove it, and thereby the response accords with reason. Nec obstat dicere, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

A confession would thus be rendered odious to others: for it is truly only the confession that becomes odious if a penitent is dissuaded from Confession, and this odium is to be entirely avoided by the institution of this Sacrament, not if a confessor is chosen for a supplement, which can be appropriately confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, does indeed allow such confirmation through another triennium after the time of the supplement. For if others irrationally took exception to Confession from penitents, this odium would truly be entirely avoidable by the institution of this Sacrament. Doubt. This is the second. How is the object of sin subjected under the seal? I respond that undoubtedly, whether someone confesses that he has perhaps more freely committed adultery or did not actually seize his brother by theft; for adultery and theft both fall under the seal as objects of sin. Thus, Article 2, Number 3. Renzio. 3a. 8 q. 2.

Fillius canoni. 1 cap. 1 num. 32 i. Sporerud. Three three five. . Chapter three n. Six. They probably say that, if one who is contrite confesses, saying that he has seen a murder committed in public and confessed it on account of public notoriety, the confessor should not be bound by the seal, even though through accident it chance to fall to the lot of the confessor. Otherwise, where there is no danger of revelation either by light penalties

or by serious matters of penance, it should be confessed according to law (n. 6 5 6 at the end). « III. Penitence indisposed, if grave, that is, which is accustomed to injure for mortality (as this one now was), says Corona B.

V. Not truly Miserere) Avers. who, in the eighteenth session. sixth. IV. Circumstantial peccata, quas interesset taceret poenitentia, licet dicae sint post absolutionem, v. gr., si spirulis sacros Ordines suscipiat, si nobilitatem jactaverit, etc.; bona vero poenitentiae et alia impedientia, quae per accidens interponuntur, nec odium Sacramenti pariant; v. gr., propositum religionis vel matrimonii, solum si nimirum poenitens ea tecta velit, cadunt sub obligatione secreti naturalis et non sacramentalis. They receive it. » and Confession, nisi poenitens talia dixerit in ordine ad explicanda peccata: tunc enim signillo sacramentale claudi tenent cum Diana passae. 5 T. 11 R. 5.

The same is affirmed by Gran. against c. R. 30. * (Speaking of virtues and vices, Sa, v.). Confession no. 32. Henriq. apud Lugo d. 23 n. 58 negant omnino eas cadere sub sigillo, cum non sint materia Confessionis. But rather Lugo, loco citato, p. 581. Croix n. 1947, cum Stoz et 10 ar. 2 num. 2 distinguunt et recte negant, si virtutes aut revelationes manifestantur in confessione, ut status animae confessario innotescat; secus vero si dicantur ad explicandum aliquem defectum vel propriam ingratintem erga Deum.) Idem dicunt de defectibus naturalibus (v. gr. illegitimum esse), et de vitiosis occultis corporis etc., qui ea sub sigillum cadere abso luto ajunt apud Diana l. c. R. 29.

Moreover concerning those things which affect others and yet are not sins. c. R. 38. Finally concerning scruples (contra qui absolute negat); Likewise they hold C. de Lugo, namely if the penitent confesses scrupulosity, or brings forward peccata or conscience for declaration, he says falls under seal, because it is at least in oblique matter of confession. Likewise, if it is not known from the penitent's narrative, but seems and appears, for example, from the manner of confessing; similarly, it is said concerning other natural defects, e.g., If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict when applied to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, is considered blasphe-mous, rudimentary, and benighted. And thus the Confessor who spoke about the penitent can be excused if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict when applied to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, is considered blasphe-mous, rudimentary, and benighted.

He suffers from defects such as being insipid, dull-witted, etc., and in this way the Confessor who spoke about the penitent is justified. See d. 23 sect. 3 n. 6o.

Grand. tamen id improbat, et ait esse periculosum, et posse facile frangi sigillum indirecte. Cap. III. Dub. I. Of Penitential Accessories. 143 - tê. Finally. Chapter 3.

This doctrine neither willingly acquiesces to what is merely probable, nor is it improperly called common, according to c. Gran. » otherwise likewise limiting he says: If this defect, for example, if I am boorish, unrefined, scrupulous, etc., be noted everywhere, it should not fall under censure if they are unknown, because confession ought to be free from every hatred. » They shall be more suitably discussed later. It is questioned whether the Confessor violates the seal if he makes known the natural defects of his penitent, namely, if a Confessor should be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odious, strict, and binding in the case of ordinary, not extraordinary election. Is it ignoble, poor, or ignorant, deaf, and similar? Response: si Confessarius tales defectus noverit, quatenus a poenitente fuerint manifestati ad explicanda peccata, tunc cerè cadunt sub sigillo, ut communiter cum Busembach docent 33 sectio 2 notatio 5. 5 § 2 notatio 6.

Lugo, d. 23, n. 59. 25. Sporer n. 841. Cross n. 1947. and others at various places, against Vasaq. And this, even though the manifestation of these defects adds nothing to the explanation of sin, but rather the penitent already lays them bare for a fuller manifestation of his conscience, as Croix rightly noted in loc., with Lugo and Stoz. However, if the Confessor knows those defects insofar as they incidentally or irrelevantly occur in the Confession, so that they are commonly taken as presumptuous by Fill. tr. 7 c. 11 n. 321 and . . n. 23, with Dict. et c. cum Con.

Rule. Zer., et aliis. And this is very probable (what opposes Renzi on page 318, question 3, with Soto, Val and Diana, whom he cites). The reason is because, when the penitent himself subsequently discovers such defects, without any order for explaining the sins, they are deemed to be minimally subjected (and could not possibly have been subjected) to the keys of sealing, since they pertain to Confession in no way. They also say that Lugo says on day 23 n. 60, and on page 643 Mazz. ll. cc. Diana p. 5 tr. 11 R. 50 (who calls it a commanem) ac. c. with Aversa, et 144 Lib: VI. Treatise.

IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance: those deficiencies shall be manifest to the Confessor from the actions of the penitent himself, or from the manner of confession; namely, if any Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can sufficiently be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the context of an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. If some such deficiencies exist, they are deemed blasphe-mous, deaf, dumb, obtuse in mind, etc. The reason given is that such defects at that time do not constitute matter, nor pertain to the matter of confession, since the Priest does not perceive them from the relation of the penitent, but perceives and apprehends them himself; hence they are not considered congruent to be secret, nor fall under the seal. And thus likewise Lugo says, l.c., if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously interpreted concerning ordinary election, not supplementary. For when the penitent shows himself as troubled in nature, irresolute, more obstinate to believe, all these defects are not matter for confession, because they are not heard but made in the confession, nor do they fall under the seal. But this opinion is justly contradicted by Antoine, p. 546, Sporer, n. 844. Renzi p. 318 q. 3 et. cum Nec acquiesco opinioni Lugonis qui l. c. subdit non cadere sub sigillo peccata quae commiserit poenitens in ipsa Confessione puta impatientiae contumeliae in Confessarium vel in alios quia culpas illas poenitens non confitetur sed committit vidente Confessario.

Neither (did I) acquiesce to this opinion, because such sins, although they are not matter for seal, yet involve a breach of the revelation; for it is a probable indication that if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, his confession might be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be interpreted odiously and strictly in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Confessor, aut non noluisset absolvere, aut acriter reprehenderit propter aliquam culpam Graviorum. Moreover they say, c. 3 n. 13., 10 ar. 2 n. 5., and consent Wigand tr. 13 n. 128. as if aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si defectus naturales paupertatis ignobilitatis et similium ita. Chapter III. Dubi I.

 are referred to by the penitent, so that from the accessories it may be gathered that they are commonly known; then they do not fall under seal, because then it is not presumed that the penitent narrates them unless compelled, nor wishes to subject himself to keys, when he has expressly declared otherwise. But this opinion is not deservedly consented to by presumption, v. 4 for the same reason as above, namely, because, since those deficiencies are known through the Confession of sins to the Confessor, it would seem that penitents would thereby confess them publicly in the Confession. If a confessor should be chosen as a supplement, his choice could well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, for the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when it concerns an ordinary election, but not extraordinary. The authors cited above speak similarly concerning other natural deficiencies, namely, that presumption regarding scrupulosity may arise, such that the confessor could say his penitent was scrupulous, if he knew this either from the manner of confessing or because the scrupulosity of another is publicly known. But equally we do not acquiesce to this opinion, even those who cite [such] arguments, because the same reasoning applies: many grievously object to being called scrupulous. So great a thing could be admitted only if it scarcely entailed any burden on the penitent, as is often the case with secular matters, which are more praised, when it is said that if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in ordinarii elections, not extraordinary ones. For authors cited above speak of other natural defects; they say that a presumptuous defect of scrupulosity can arise, namely, when the confessor says his penitent is scrupulous if he knows it or by the manner of confession, or if the scrupulosity of the penitent is publicly known. If it is said concerning a Prelate, Confessor, or similar ones, in respect to whom scrupulosity is a sign of a confused mind and an irresolute one.

It is said, however, from practice, “(if an confessory is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a confessory beyond three years, being odious and strict in ordinary election but not extraordinary, makes one scrupulous; this indeed is an indication of good and careful conscience for those who engage in secular matters.), if a penitent is commonly recognized to be very prolix, uneasy, etc., in explaining something, then because it would clearly appear that the confessory flees lest he be afflicted by the natural prolixity, uneasiness, etc. of his own tediousness, in such circumstances to flee would not be a

breach of seal.) This can possibly be admitted if commonly it is apparent to others that this penitent has a conscience of careful fear, so that they might consider him as delayed and certain from greater sins." Here you go, what should the Confessor do, if someone confesses some grave matter not sufficiently? Lib. 146. VI. Treatise. IV.

Regarding the Sacrament of Penance. Having been tainted, and therefore questioning the penitent about circumstances, custom, or similar matters, he will know the penitent to be stubborn if that person responds minimally adequatively to interrogations, and furthermore if the confessor is unable to elevate his voice lest bystanders hear? I respond: If at the beginning of the confession he observes the penitent's deafness, let him impose upon him that he return at another time and place, where the confessor may speak freely without others hearing. And meanwhile it is permitted to make known to others the surdity of the penitent, when such a defect commonly becomes openly apparent. If however he observe this in the course of the Confession, and the penitent after several proper interrogations correctly not respond, it is not permitted to the Confessor loudly impose on the penitent; that he return [there], so that those present might hear this, because great suspicion would thereby be given them. If for supplement there is chosen a Confessor, his election can well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be received more stringently concerning ordinary than extraordinary elections; and that matter being grave he will have confessed it. Therefore, in such a case, I consider it advisable that the Confessor, understanding the sins as much as possible by a better method; absolve absolutely, if the penitent is probably deemed disposed; but conditionally, if there is doubt about the disposition.

I nihilo hunc casum apud DD. non inveni, sed obvius est. 65 « Resp. 2. By the seal are bound all to whom in any manner or form the knowledge of the sacramental confession reaches: what is I. Confessor, qui... si de audiitis in confessione rogatus fuerit, potest negare praesumptionem, si opus est, cum juramento subintelligendo; si aliquis eligatur pro supplemento Confessarius bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. » It can be said, or rather (as stated by Card. de Lugo, d. 23), if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after

the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strictly to be understood in regard to ordinary election, not supplementary, what he states, if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strictly to be understood in regard to ordinary election, not supplementary. may be known by useful knowledge to respond to one asking outside of confession. » Excepit Henricus et Gregorius: si de publica meretrice rogaretur, an non esset confessa formicatiouem; tunc enim, deduci directam responsionem, dicendum esset, illam confessam esse peccata, et se finitum officium suum.

Iudeo, si peccatum suum salvo sigillo non possit conferiri debet omittere, quia sigillum strictius obligat quam integritas Confessionis. ». Chapter III. Doubt. I. Concerning the Accessories of Penance. It is queried, whether when the confessor is questioned about a penitent's sin No. 64, he can presume that he does not know it with an oath?

It must be affirmed with common doctrine, which D. Thom. supports in his supplement: question 11, article 1 ad 3 S. 33 sectio 6 num. 7. Antoine p. 449 qu. 6. Wig. tr. 13 n. 111. . 722. 13. cum et Henriq. ac Lugo d. 23 num. 73. cum Vasq. (qui opinionem oppositam Gabrielis vocat erroneam) et aliis communiter. A reason is brought forth by D. Thom., l.c., who says: A man is not brought forward as a witness, except as a man; therefore... he can swear to having confessed, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this reason, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; without injustice it is imputable. See what is said in book 3, n. 152. v.

Cross l. cit., cum Stoz, et Ratio: quia tunc Confessarius respondent secundum juramentum factum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia

prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. semper factum intelligitur modo, quo fieri poterat, nempe manifes- tandi veritatem sine æquivocatione, sed sine aquivo- catione illa, quæ licitè omitti poterat: quòad aquivo- cationem vero necessariam, quæ non poterat omitti absque peccato, nec alter habet jus, ut sine aquivo- catione ei respondeatur, nec ideò Confessurius tenetur sine æquivocatione respondere. However, from the beginning, the confessor should respond to such questions: These questions ought not to be asked. Furthermore, if he is asked whether he will absolve someone? Respond: Functiones meae officii consummavit, ut ait Antonius p. 549. Lugo n. 85. and 28. with 148.

Lib. VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance.

Reg. et Gran. But sometimes such a response might not be deemed sufficiently secure; hence it is always better to respond by reprimanding the questioner: What kind of question is this that you are asking? If however, the Confessor does not absolve someone, and while celebrating Mass interrogates him as to whether he should place the formula for the Communion of that penitent? The Confessor shall respond: Question him himself whether he desires to communicate; thus rightly according to Henry and Gratian 647. "II." He to whom one is delivered as having been absolved by the reserved, either from him who asks for permission to absolve from the reserved.

» ... (Concina p. 747 n. 30; Antoine p. 550. The » lesser note number 512. In section 4, note 3. and with Gran. and others. The reason is as follows: firstly, because that petition constitutes an inchoate Confession which tends towards obtaining absolution; secondly, because a certain number of Confessions would become odious. Ita verius AA. cit. contra Palarum p. 19 § 4 n. 10. cum Vasq.

» and Interpreter. * (Ita probabilius Lugo d. 23 n. 21. et cum » Bonac. Say: etc., against Solum, and those who say that the Interpreter is indeed bound to keep an absolute secret, but not sacramental. * IV. Whoever, either through theft or by chance, hears something seditiously, it is permitted even though accused. * (Ita also comm.) » 5. when to a reader, 'n. 61. when with 21 n. 39. » cum Et sic pariter » are held to the seal of confession in the presence of those who stand, for it is necessary that the Confession be made, such as in a shipwreck, or in some similar circumstance, etc. » n. 4. cum Adr.

Vasquez, Com. et; if he places himself only with a view to his own

confusion, he wishes publicly to confess. Cum omnes quibus aliquid sacrilegè revelatum est, unde de hoc nebulosius inter se colloqui possunt. * (Ita communiter Conc. - Cap. Hl. Dub. I. On the Accessories of Penance. - 1. 30. with Gabr. and others, against Med.) * VI. Laicus, qui pro Sacerdote est habitus * (Ita praesumptum . 3 n. 3. 737 n. 4. et Lug. d. 23 n. 4. cum aliis communiter, contra Solum, et Doctor vel alius, qui cum venia poenitentis consulitur, ut habet communior sententia * (Et probabilior, prout nos dicemus n. seq. 648.) contra 15 R. 15 VIII.

Who wrote to a novice confessor of someone. IX. He who finds a written confession and reads it, as he teaches whose opinion is probable: According to which, although such a one be bound by a natural secrecy, he would still commit a mortal sin if he should publish it widely out of gravitas and calumny; but otherwise, if knowing that the matters are only trivial, he reads them from curiosity. Whereupon consequently in the case of grave necessity, such a written confession might be revealed (Lugo argues against this, except where it has been willed through writing to confess thus, like one who is mute, or to petition for the faculty of absolution from reserved cases). V. d. 23 n. 48.) Xi.

According to some, it is presumed that the penitent himself would confess; but it is more probable that he be bound by the nature of secrecy, on account of the matter, if so required by the circumstances, to keep silent about what has been heard from the Confessional. See (Thus commonly and more truly; section 33, chapter 4, note 2, he who asserts this as certain, Bonac. par. 3 in pr.). Salmant. num. 67. Wigand trans., n. 119, et alii in diversis locis, affirmant quia sigillum institutuum est tantum in favorem poenitentium, non Confessariorum; ergo jus sigillis conferatur non Confessuris sed tantum poenitentibus. However, all with .

This, and he is bound to keep this secret (if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received strictly in ordinary elections, not in extraordinary ones—what is natural)—some are stricter; for others voluntary counsels offer, but a Confessor is bound to offer. VI. Tract: IV. Of the Sacrament of Penance. office.

Wherefore, since the Confessor is necessarily obliged to give penitential counsel, that he may guard himself from spiritual perdition, therefore the penitent is more strictly bound to guard against it, lest harm come to the Confessor through the counsel given him. However, this question I now inquire about. Whether a consultor, having been consulted by the confessor at the discretion of the penitent, is bound to observe the

sacramental seal? There is a triple opinion. First according to Jo. Medina Cod. concerning those who have a celestial conference.

Palaces de Pœnit. par. 19 § 4 n. 8 with and others, 2 n 10. In one treatise thus (he says) it is not bound by the seal of the consultant to the penitent, because such a manifestation does not aim at obtaining absolution from the consultant; neither is he bound as confessor through whose medium the penitent manifested himself to him. Then, because (as he says. The second opinion considers that counselors are not bound by secrecy, because knowledge of the sin is not manifested to them for the purpose of obtaining absolution, but for the purpose of instructing the Confessor; and this should be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another three-year period after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, being odious and strict, should be interpreted strictly concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Thus, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another three-year period after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, being odious and strict, should be interpreted strictly regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Lugo n. 26, licet ipse sit pro sententia opposita, tamen huic rationi consentiat); sed tenèri ad servandum secretum aretissimum, ità ut nullo casu possit illud revelare. The reason for this is very urgent, because when such a thing happens rapidly, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, as being odious and strictly to be understood in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, is that, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, as being odious and strictly to be understood in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary.

Confessarii alios consulant ex licentia poenitentium; redderetur utique odiosa confessio, si aliquo casu notitia confessionis posset manifestari. The third sentiment is more probable than that which he himself confesses to be common among all, teaching that the penitentiary council should be held equal and confessorial with regard to the seal, so that whenever notitia of the sin is manifested to it, the confessor may well perform his office diligently. Thus in section 33, article 4, note 6, he who holds that to be certain, says Lugo. Palud. item Sylvius, Bon. n. 854. They also hold the same, Croix, Mazzot. . Antou.

And the same thing expressesively teaches S. Thom. in the Fourth Book, Twenty-First Question, Third Article, question three and article two, answer four. The reason would be considered from the very institution of the Sacrament, on account of which it is believed. Christus Dominus in posuisse hanc obligationem sigilii non solum Confessariis, sed omnibus aliis, quibus immediate vel mediate perveniret notitia peccatorum, occasione sive in ordine ad Confessionem; alioquin non satis provisum esset reverentiae hujus Sacramenti, nec satis odium Confessionis amotum fuisset. According to this principle commonly accepted, one is necessarily bound by the seal. Doctor consultus ex licentia poenitentis; nam indirecte manifestatur ei notitia Confessionis ad ordinem absolutionis pertinens et per sacramentum perfectiendum.

Neither does it hinder to say that, when a penitent obtains permission from the confessor to speak with others about his own sin, it is reckoned as extrabearing from the bounds of secrecy; for I answer that, if a confessor be chosen for supplementarily, he can sufficiently be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly interpreted regarding ordinary election and not extraordinary. The presumption being very uncertain, as Sporer and Lugo add, it should rather firmly be supposed otherwise, namely, that if a confessor be chosen for supplementarily, he can sufficiently be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly interpreted regarding ordinary election and not extraordinary. The penitent gains permission from him even beyond any limitation which might possibly apply. Here it must be noted I: if some Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can indeed be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly interpreted in terms of ordinary election, not supplementary one. For that presumption is very uncertain; rather, as Sporer and Lugo add, it should firmly be presumed otherwise, namely, if some Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can indeed be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly interpreted in terms of ordinary election, not supplementary one. Thus, the penitent grants him permission with all limitation that can be. VI. Tract. Fourth.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. The confession has not yet been completed. Reason, because delay is considered permission granted by the penitent from the time the confession begins until the sacrament is completed. Nota II. Si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari

per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; licet dicat Lugo n. 30: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; et si Doctor consulitur circa idem à duobus Confessariis, quibus ponitens seorsim confessus est, ipse loqui non poterit uni de auditis ab alio; oppositum tamen puto verum, quid cum ponitens licentiam præbet secundo Confessorio, ut de suo peccato loquatur eidem Consiliario; congruent certo creditur ponitens nolle aliud consilium nisi rectum, ita certo præsumitur velle, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Ipse Doctor liberè loquatur de omnibus, quæ scit à praemo Confessario, et quæ pertinent ad rectum consilium præstandum. 49. It is questioned. An is, à quo petit consilium ponitens in ordine ad suam Confessionem faciendam, tenetur ad sigillum sacramentale?

The first sentiment affirmates, and thus they hold this. Sporer n. 836. Antoine page 505. v. Hence, Concilium page 747. note 30 and Croix page 1952. with Fag. Diana, Stoz, et Gormaz.

Reason; because since it often happens that penitents require to receive counsel from another before Confession, so that they may confess correctly, an alternative obligation was imposed to render the Confession odious and odious would become the Confession. The second opinion is more probable: namely, it denies this and those who hold it are wrong. III sect. 4 n. 6 Henr. l. 6 cap. 21 n. 4 also Aversa, et Illsung apud Croix l. c. Raio, because (as the Doctors commonly teach) the obligation of the seal arises solely from the sacramental confession, in which the penitent actually manifests his sins for absolution; thus too, the Council of Peter page 737 n. 3 and others frequently with Thomas in IV d. 21 q. 3 art. 1 q. 2. But on the contrary: where it is expressly stated by one saying: The seal of confession does not extend except to those things concerning which there is a sacramental confession. Wherefore, because of the manifestation of sin, which is made by the penitent before the confessor, but does not actually occur in the act of confession nor for the purpose of obtaining absolution from it, the confessor will indeed be bound to secrecy naturally,

but not sacramentally; so that if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can properly be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to an ordinary election, but not extraordinary, it is more probable for a penitent to acquire no right except through actual confession before him from whom he expects absolution. Antecedently responding to the opposite reason, if a confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond the triennium is most odious and strictly to be received in regard to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones; therefore, it would be more probable that no penitent acquire any right, unless at actual confession before him from whom he expects absolution.

Nemo est tenendum ullo casu alteri; quomodo confessori detegere peccata sua ut integre confiteatur et ideo qui ultra vult peccatum aliquod consiliario pa:effacere nequit ipsum obstringere ad sigillum sa-cramentale. Thus it is said by Heinriques according to the aforementioned reference (who thinks that with Suarez, whom he cites, something probable can be found, but as we shall say shortly, not well), if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it may indeed be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be understood regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary election, that if the penitent should commit his sins beforehand with the Priest for the purpose of confession which he wishes to make later, the Confessor would not be bound by the sacramental seal. But I do not acquiesce to this, because such a manifestation is in some way an initial Confession, since at that time the penitent provides a manifestation of his own sin, so that he may more quickly expedite the Confession thereafter; nor does it seem otherwise that P. Suarez understands it, for there he does not speak of a manifestation before the same Confessor, but only of one made before another. It is asked III. Is one bound to secrecy who reads the 650th charter, in which the penitent wrote a Confession?

The first opinion affirms this, and Antoine maintains this on page 550. v. Herefrom, Sporer no. 857. 99 q. 3 with also Mald. Page 4, Reason 112. The reason is, first, because that scripture was proximately ordered to the Confession, and hence it is held as a kind of inchoate Confession, or as performing the office of a completed Confession; secondly, because such manifestation of a scripture, which usually happens most frequently in general or prolix Confessions, would make an odious Confession. Nevertheless, the more common opinion, and the one that is probable, is this:

VI. Treat. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. It denies this, and they hold this. III, section 4, note 5. Wigandt translates 13 n. 119 (who calls it probabillissimam) 10 art. 3 n. 3. 23 n. 47. with Henry and Megala, Soto; but the scriptural passage is not a Confession, but only preparation for Confession; hence the penitent acquires the right to the seal only before the confessor, who provides the document necessary for obtaining absolution, not before others who can read that outside the act of confession.

It is no hindrance to say that if a penitent should have a Confessor chosen as a supplement, his confession can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious and strict as it is with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, his confession could be rendered somewhat odious by an alternative quin, since many tend to write their confessions so as to confess more accurately. For it is answered in the same manner as above in the preceding question, namely, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For scripture does not require a Confession, but only for the aid of memory; hence the manifestation of the reader would not make the Confession odious, but only the list of sins; to which no one is bound. They nevertheless receive Lugo: Si mutus confiteatur per scripturam Confessario praesenti, et casualiter alius eam legat; quia tunc legens vere haurit notitiam peccatorum ex actuali illius Confessione. 2. If anyone should petition by letter for permission from the Superior for a reserved case, according to what was said in no. 646. Besides, Wigandt and Lugo correctly allow for presumption: if you read a document left behind in the confessional after a confession has been completed, or if it is handed to the Priest for the purpose of making a confession, because such handing over constitutes a kind of inchoate confession.

Other cases having been dismissed, Sporer says that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict as it is regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, would gravely sin in those reading (and thereby revealing) such writing unless they knew the least sins to be contained daily (see the aforementioned 1.5 n. 70). Moreover, concerning Junt, that if a Confessor is chosen for

supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict as it is regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary. This they say in case (which they call Cap. III. Dub. I. On Accessories of Penance. 155. It can sometimes happen in great necessity, for example, to save the Republic or the life of an innocent person, that a secret might lawfully be revealed. 1. It is possible to happen, at times in great necessity, for example to save the Republic or the life of an innocent person, that a secret could licitly be revealed.

Outside the confession, with the permission of the penitent, it is permissible to speak about what has been heard in the confession, whether immediately or even with anyone else; although it may be dangerous. St. Thomas Aquinas. Suarez, Major. Gabr. Where he says: Potest..... confessus facere, » if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict and to be understood of ordinary election and not extraordinary, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious, strict and to be understood of ordinary election and not extraordinary.

Sarerdos sciebat... ut Deus, sciat praesumptum ut » homo, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. facit dum licentiat eum ad dicendum; et » ideo sit dicat, non frangit sigillum. And thus presumptuously Lugo d. 23 n. 133. Concina p. 140 n. 14. Wigandt "tract. 13 n. 115 and others commonly." Reason, because if the Confession is an institution solely for the benefit of penitents.)* Regarding which permission is required I.

» that it may be formal and expressed; for presumed, tacit, interpretative, and virtual (presumed for the good of the very penitent himself) is insufficient. 6. Tan. » II. That it may be free, » and spontaneous, not by force, injury, nor through extorted importunate prayers, nor through presumptuous obedience obtained through reverential fear from the

Confessor himself. Heur.

Fagund 1. c. R. 10 et 24 * (Dict Croix 1. 6 p. 2 n. 1958: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si poenitens non ultro, sed tantum ad petitionem Confessarii det licentiam loquendi, com- muniter licentia censenda sit data ex metu reverentia- li(a) addit. Furthermore, such a license should be sought only for reasonable cause, which rightly adds: if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. It is better to induce the penitent; so that he may give license for external confession.) * III. Not revoked; for a penitent, out of caprice and without cause, can always be dismissed, they teach. cc. * (Ita 156 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. Now Sporer n. 82i and Noe hold that it is necessary for there to be in writing, II c. However, if there is doubt whether the Confessor, when spoken to with permission, should more be believed as speaking on behalf of the Priest than of the penitent, according to Graff and c. R. 4 or even rather as heirs; for example, if by reason of permission the deceased reveals the need for restitution to be made by them. » Tan. et c. R. 32.

V. It is certainly proper to be so; whether this permission be given verbally or fictitiously, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood of an ordinary election, not of an extraordinary one; indeed. Let it be equivalent to an expressed concession; for instance, if a penitent begins to speak with a Confessor outside of confession regarding matters from the confession; then, for this reason, it is possible to follow up on this, as teach Aversa quæstio 18, sed. 7. Tann. in append. c. 2. ex Bonac. * Thus commonly Lugo d. 23 n. 131. Concina p. 740 n. 14. . 720.

Antoine p. 547. v. Here Sporer n. 620. Reply 1. Nevertheless, Benè attentively notes Lugo in the aforementioned place. If a penitent is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict,

should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary, which in this case still persists regarding high seals, because although the penitent speaks outside of Confession, he is nevertheless considered not to have provided another license dependent upon having completed Confession.)* 652 *2.

The seal is broken if with the penitent outside the confession, without his permission, you act upon what has been heard in the confession, or if you show that you know such things. (Nevertheless, it is commonly said that the confessors may immediately after absolution speak to the penitent about what has been heard in the confession, before he departs; for although the Sacrament is complete, the judgment still retains a temporal character.) R. 19 » with Fag. recently holding Lugo on the 23rd n. 120. n. 741. and Verric. and Croix n. 1900 with Praep. Henry Chapter III. Dub.

I. Of Accessories of Penance. 157 » He says and Stotz) If a confessarius is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessarius beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. However, he thinks. » and Bonac. and others against Fill. R. 87. *(See what is said in no. 623.*) I said, Extrd., that within the confession mention can be made of previous offenses, as is evident from the practice of confessors who argue based on repetition and sometimes deny absolution.

Thus Henry. Prior. Gratia. XX. Where himself with c. and p. 2 tr. 2 misc. 11 res, 18. It is therefore asked, whether within the Confession, the penitent can speak with the confessor about sins heard in another confession, without the latter's permission?

Diana with Fag. denies as stated above, but the common and more correct opinion affirms it, which Lugo teaches in his decree on the 23rd day, note 127. Wigandt translated number 13, entry 120. Resp. 1, Antoine p. 550 v. Herefrom, Sporer n. 823. Renzi p. 307 qu. 5 cum Aversa, Dict. et Ratio, quia saepe pertinet ad munera Judicis, et Medici, quae habet Confessarius, recolere peccata prioris Confessionis, ad melius pœnitentem, corripiem, dum vel dirigendum; ideo improbable est, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. pœnitens habeat jus sigillum in actu Confessionis, cum potius verum sit si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa,

stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

Confessor habeat jus exquirendi omnia, quorum notitia ad meliorem directionem coadjuvare valeat. Hence the confessor will be able to speak with the penitent about all sins confessed by him in the past, whenever he deems it useful for the penitent's welfare, who is considered to offer a confession, granting permission to use any knowledge necessary for his better direction. 3. Confessarius habeat jus exquirendi omnia, quorum notitia ad meliorem directionem coadjuvare valeat. He breaks the seal who says that he has heard a grave sin in such a monastery, although the name of the person is not mentioned. 35 and others with 3 and 158 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Fourth. Of the Sacrament of Penance. "Evil." And gravely it is added to him who says, "In this, or in that Religious Order this, or that sin has been admitted as allowed, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, which, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, is known from mere Confession: but neither from city, nor certain place where anyone has heard confessions, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, makes grave those things, or similar such as, and other sins commonly committed (nisi- undè constet), teach Hurt.

Kellis. et cit., res. 35; quia potest redundare in gravamen, et infamiam ipsius Communictatis, et fortè praesumptum civium in particulari, quando civitas non est ampla, et poenitentes suspecti, atque adeò confessio fieret illis odiosa. See. c. et res. 36 ubi cum Mald. "It teaches that the confessor who has few penitents subject to him (for example, ..." Monastic sisters of a single convent) are prone to blush and confess readily if admonished concerning the vices heard in confession before them: because those who have confessed are easily overcome by shame. * (Nevertheless, this is to be understood thus: if the confessor speaks of some particular fault of a certain monastic sister or of that same convent; but carelessly, if he speaks of defects which commonly occur or can occur in all convents.) * Dubium hic habetur hîc i. If the Confessor violates the seal, when he asserts that grave crimes have been committed in some place, which he himself heard

confessed: the first opinion denies this, and Renzi holds this at page 322 question 11 with Fagundez and Onuphrius so writing.

"16 n. 749 qui consentit n. 750, si nullo modo in cognitionem personae deveniri possit, quia alias (ut dicunt) ex lati revelatione nulla fit injuria poenitentis." The second however opinion is most common and far more probable, as Concina holds on page 740 note 13. . 10 article 2 note 7. . 5 chapter 3 §. 5, and 23 note 64 with the teaching: if a penitentiary confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a confessory beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received stringently regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, then if the town is small (that is, if it does not consist of about three thousand men), the violet seal is violated. Rutio; quia, licet tunc non reveletur persona; tamen, cum revelatione Cap. III. Dub. I.

Regarding the Judgments of Penance. It is fitting for the infamous reputation of the entire community to be increased by this, since it brings presumption upon the burden of the penitent who is a member of that communal judgment; and hence such a revelation should render it odious to him. II. cc. contra t. 4 p. 90 q. 4 praesumptum concionatoribus, modo non dicant se audire in Confessionibus; idem sentit Habert t. 6 p. 261 q. 14. Reply 3 saying that it is licit for confessors to generically inveigh against vices which secretly prevail: And this is expressly permitted in the case chapter If a Priest [is] Two from the Office. Jub. ord., ubi dicitur: Si sacerdos sciat pro certo aliquem esse reum ut cuius criminis, vel si confessus fuerit... non debet eum arguere nominatim, sed indeterminate. That is, generally, as Panormus explains. Doubt is raised 2.

Whether he who breaks the seal of Confession, one who says that a Religious from such a Convent has confessed to him a serious sin, does this violate? Escobarius denies it in his book, libellus 16, note 713, with Henry. Whether, however, Fagn. and Candido do not interfere with notitia of a particular person, only in this manner. However, Verins affirm Busemburgensis, section 33, paragraph 3. Diana, p. 5, tr. 11, R. 23. Item S. Anton, n. 754.

Reason, because then each of those assemblies suffers damage. And thus equally will Confessors violate the seal if they say that such sins were committed in that convent. Not indeed (as reasonably says P. as was said above), if he were to say only that a sin of some Religious of some Order had been heard: because this neither is a revelation of a seal, nor is it grievous to the penitent; for in every Order there are some evils; hence

neither does scandal arise, nor is the Religion defamed, unless (rightly limited) the Religion be one of stricter observance. «4.. Nottiatio in sola confessione accepta nullo casu66s » uti licet, si periculum sit revelationis, saltèm indirecte. But, if no danger exists of a transgression, as in jokingly saying, "Such sins were confessed by a Religious of that Order in that convent." VI.

Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. Shining, or the use of knowledge may become evident, although it seems probable that one may use governance for another's direction, such as by offering suffrage to him whom from a single confession he knows to be unworthy, or by closing the door, if any confessor is selected in lieu of another during an addition, well can his confirmation be completed through another triennium following the time of the addition, because the prohibition against not selecting a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict as it concerns ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if any confessor is selected for an addition, well can his confirmation be completed through another triennium following the time of the addition, because the prohibition against not selecting a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict as it concerns ordinary election, not extraordinary. » He who enters at night to commit sin: likewise, by knowing the nature of sedition through warning, impeding openly Marriage, when the impediment is known, as they teach Vasq.

Henry. Con. 4 R. 76, et p. 5 tr. 1 R. 3. et alii; quia haec doctrina posset pœnitentem absterrere à confessione. And indeed, such a method of governing Religions has been prohibited by the Superiors in the year 1594, when in the Society. JESU jam ante idem statutum esset, prohibitumque contrarium docere. See indeed contrary to true governance of one's own self in such a case it is more plausible to make use of that knowledge, for instance, by abstaining from the cup in which poison is known to be, or by avoiding the wood where one knows himself to have been prepared for death through the confession of a single robber.

Henry Con: 11 R. 46. It begins with doubt 4, etc., which permits penance to be given, even though death might loom as a consequence to be borne by the penitent from associates. See loc. cit. n. 108. It is fifth.

Finally, to do something from which the penitent could know that it was done through knowledge of confession, they deny D. and co.; Sylv. 3 t. 4 R. 46 affirms this. They also confirm this from Lugo: and if a desire should appear more audacious to show itself, or should it be repelled; otherwise, if it finds displeasure in it, or at least makes confession odious or difficult, not to make it so; for example, if it cause indignation or provoke hatred, or

fall into temptation from a certain fact or statement of the Confessor himself, therefore he himself should abstain from such facts or statements, etc. All these matters are to be carefully examined. It is doubted I. Whether, on account of a sin heard in confession, a superior can dispense his subject from duty? Sambovius affirmat.

Caus. i8. He taught this previously: Therefore, if indeed removal from office can induce a subject to confess a perceived sin in confession or entertain some probable suspicion regarding it, in no way should the Prelate withdraw such removal. Si vero per amotionem peccatum nullatenus manifestaretur, tunc alia occasione accepta poteret subditum ad administrationem removere et deberet hoc facere cum debita cautela. And the same is confirmed in Suppl. q. 1 a. 1 ad 3. They likewise say St. Bonaventure and Gabriel.

Palud. et Adrian. ad: d. 33 sect. 7., qui hanc sententiam voant communem ut reverè erat inter antiquos. But today the Decree of Clement opposes this doctrine. VIII (on cases reserving to all for any year 1594 where it was said: So likewise Superiors existing in office at a time, as well as Confessors who have been promoted to higher grades of office, should carefully beware lest the knowledge which they have had concerning the sins of others in confession be used for exterior governance. Although this decree was issued solely for regular Superiors, nevertheless 20 and Croix rightly contend that it should be extended to all (whatever they say). Haberthür l.c.), according to the same reason which compels it for regulars, may be valid also for seculars, lest confession be rendered odious.

Furthermore, this is rendered more certain by another decree of Innocent XI, as we shall see shortly in the following Doubt. Doubt is cast. Whether a Superior in the election of a benefice or office may withhold his suffrage from him whom he knows solely by confession to be unworthy? Sambovius the same affirms l.c. with S. Anthony III p. tit. 16 c. 22 § i in § 62 Lib. VI.

Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. end, where it is written: He who has free choice, even though by mere confession he might be cited as worthy for a prelature which he himself had considered fitting for another, ought not to choose it from his sufficiency of conscience; because by choosing knowingly either the worthy or the unworthy one, business is transacted between himself and God. Wherefore can it be presumed from these things that God knows, to judge in purpose? But altogether it must be denied with Sporer n. 869. . 1977.

Holzrn. 1. c. . cited by and others. This day it is certain from the Decree. The Sacred Congregation in the year 1682, November 18, by which the following proposition was proscribed: Knowledge acquired from confession, if it be fitting to acquire it, should be obtained without either direct or indirect revelation and burden of the penitent, unless otherwise results from not doing so would entail something much more gravely harmful. Moreover, it is added from the application or limitation that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary, regarding the use of acquired science from confession without any direct or indirect revelation, and in the case where much more grievous burden would follow from non-use. This said proposition, so far as it admits the use of said science with the burden of the penitent, is deemed presumptuous with the present explanation; forbidding, etc., mandating the same to all ministers of the Sacrament of Penance, that they altogether abstain from bringing that (doctrine) into practice.

Hence they well observe; Mazzotta and Croix 11. cc. it is illicit for a Confessor, on account of knowledge from confession, to shut in a penitent in a chamber, lest he go to sin: remit the servant, or take away from him the keys, lest he steal: also to show the penitent a more severe countenance, or to deny him former intercourse and friendship. Nor should this be admitted, according to 1. 3 d. 16 n. 3 and 4 Croix num. 1963, 1976, and 1977 n. 717, that if a penitent is shut into a room from the knowledge of his confession in the confessional, so as to prevent him from going forth, either by dismissing him or by taking away the keys, so that he might not steal; also by showing him a severe countenance, or refusing to restore former communication and friendship, for all these things would cause great grief or humiliation for the penitent. Sporer n. 870 permissively admits this, namely, that it is licit to abstract keys or money from the chest, to shut them forth; not to commit further the keys to a servant, because all these things would amount to grievance or reproach for the penitent. Si vero Superior ex alia via quam Confessionis judicet, puta ex defectu aetiæ, scientiæ, prudentiæ, vel quia noverit alios digniores ad beneficium, tunc posse eum imò debeo suffragium poenitenti negare, dicunt Natal. de . Confess. Reg. 57 et Merb. t. 2 p. 149 qu. 5o ex . 1 ad 4 ubi dixit: Ex multis altis causis aliquid redditur indignus ad proelationis officium, quàm ex peccato, congruent ex defectu scientiæ, ætatis, etc., et ideò qui contradicit, nec suspiriōnem de crimine facit, nec Confessionem revelat.

But I hold this opinion with Petrus: in place there can be only a case where

such circumstances, otherwise known or perceived before or after Confession, might have moved the Superior to deny suffrage, even though no knowledge from Confession was present regarding the unworthiness of the penitent. Wherefore the author least of all should be heard in the Addition to Wigorniensis p. 389 l. 3, who says: If a penitent shall be chosen as a supplement, he can be confirmed for another three years after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious, strict and to be accepted as pertaining to ordinary rather than to extraordinary election; let it be known from the mere knowledge of Confession that the Superior cannot be directed to exterior governance, yet he can receive light therefrom and find another external pretext or coloration for denying suffrage. However, commonly they admit that a Confessor may use knowledge of the confession to make himself more cautious in matters of the family, to dispel indolence, and to watch over his flock more diligently; provided no suspicion of sin be given to others, nor thereby be burdened or implicitly reproached. Thus Habert, p. 261, R. 3. Antoine p. 549. v. Hence. 18. c. § VII.

Sporer n. 87o et 3 cum Soto, et Reg. ex c. ad i ubi ait: Porest (Confessarius) dicere Prælato, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. diligentius invigilet super gregem suum, ità tamen si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. non dicat ab iutd, per si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. verbo vel nutu confitentem prodat. omnia vero haec P. absolutè negat licere, dicens si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. A Confessor en toto debet gerere se, et si penitus ignorationem habeat quæ ex sola confessione consistit. VI. Treatise.

Chapter Four. Of the Sacrament of Penance. It is known by its proper signs. There is no doubt that the Confessor should proceed with the utmost caution in those aforementioned acts, since it is difficult to avoid all danger either of revelation or of burden to the penitent. Another general rule is accepted by almost everyone, that it is licit to make use of the knowledge of Confession where no revelation takes place, and where no burden is imposed upon the penitent; Thus, lib. 3, d. 16, n. 4. Lugo d. 23 n. 102.

Habert t. 6 p. 260. 33 sect. 7 n. 9. l. c. § 9. Antoine p. 549. Holzm. n. 717 et alii communiter: atque ipse Quapropter Holzman. Antoine and Mazzotta commonly admit that a priest can pray for the penitent from knowledge of the Confession, or be kinder towards him: also consult books and wise people, temper rigor, from one Confession adapt to others to be questioned or instructed, yet giving no suspicion prior to the first Confession: also: (as Holzman says ibid. v. And hence, when it is possible to forebear from dangers and occasions of spiritual or temporal damage.

And thus it is said in paragraph 658 of the Doubts, Book III. Whether a confessor can deny Communion to a penitent whom he had previously denied absolution as indisposed, if that penitent afterwards petition for Communion privately? The first opinion affirms, and they hold this. D. q. 9. un. art. 5 q. 1 dicens: Si Sacerdos sciat peccatum alicujus, qui Eucharistiam petit per Confessionem, si in occulto, debet ei denegare, et monere ne in publico petat. Item ninety-five Chapter Three.

Question. I. On the Accessories of Penance. 165 b. 2 with Saint Bonaventure and Saint Anthony, and other earlier authorities cited in lib. 3 de disp. 16 n. 6. Reason why (as they say), on one side then the precept of denying the Holy to dogs urgently demands action; from another aspect there intervenes no seal of revelation there, nor any unjust thing which would make Confession odious to those truly penitent: for such a denial or warning only those who wish to perish desire to render Confession odious, but this should not prevent the Priest from admonishing the sinner and from denying the Sacrament to the unworthy. And thus they similarly say, that a Bishop can and should refuse to confer Orders on an unworthy person according to knowledge derived from Confession, and that a Parish Priest may withhold assistance at Matrimony when he learns from Confession that there is an impediment present.

However, the second true opinion denies this, and this they hold: canons number five. Lugdunensis 25 n. 126. 17. 46. Mazzotta c. 3 qu. 5. Concina p. 742 n. 18 et Croix lib. 6 p. 2 n. 1974. Reason, because such a denial of the Sacrament or warning in Confession would render it odious, not only

to penitents illicitly seeking: it but also to presumptuous others who, if "cirent." If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. This, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary.

The penitentiary could at times make use of a confessed penitent's reputation, easily abstaining from the Sacrament of Penance. This sentence must today absolutely be held according to the aforementioned Decree preceding [paragraph] 636. Doubt. IV. Whether a Priest, who from Confession knows that traps are being set for him, may flee, or in some other way protect himself by resorting to an excuse?

It is certain that he can (as rightly says Lugo d. 23 n. 108), if from such caution a minimal manifestation of the confessed sin is made known to others, no real burden being imposed on the penitent. But it is doubtful whether it is permissible for him to flee if by his flight others, already aware of the penitent's sin, are deceived; whether such a penitent has confessed that sin. The first opinion affirms, provided no harm comes to the penitent; thus Palaus p. 5 §. 3 n. 18, a66 Lib VI. Treatise. IV.

Of the Sacrament of Penance. Wigandt translated 13 note 122 at 4. Sporer note 863. Renzi p. 309 q. 9 with Con. and Fag. and Adr. Gabr. et Henr.

Reason, because it is something different to reveal a confessed sin, and to reveal Confession of a sin already known by others; for then the sin itself is not revealed, but rather only the Confession made of that sin, if someone is chosen as Confessor as an addition, well it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the time of the addition, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one. This prohibition does not contravene the seal. The second opinion (which I follow) denies this to be permissible, and this is held by . 33 sect. 7 n. 7. Antoine p. 549. 524. 3 cum 23 n. 110 cum Soto, Vasq. Rich. and Med. Reason, because that flight would be some kind of indirect revelation of the confessed sin.

It does not prevent saying that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it

may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as regards the ordinary election, but not the extraordinary one, thus making an indirect revelation when the action is set forth from which a confessed sin necessarily follows; yet here the flight of the Confessor in no way reveals the sin, but only others argue from their own conscience that a sin has been confessed. But it is replied according to Lugo: If a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For when such conditions are posited, namely, the knowledge of the other's crime, and the confessed penitent's confession, this flight would be a true revelation, not only of the confessed confession, but also of the presumed confessed sin. Et licet Confessarius fugam simularet ex aliquo praetextu, semper tamen aliquam rationabilem suspicionem praeberet peccati confessi. But it is decreed by P. Cuniliati, tract 14, chapter 4, section 7, note 10: if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he can appropriately be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is understood in reference to ordinary election, not supplementary. Therefore, in such a case the penitent must be held to give license to the Confessor so that he may be exempt from danger; otherwise the Confessor would not be bound himself to absolve, although the penitent can always give license without grave damage to his own welfare. And he adds, if any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one; for when a penitent unjustly denies permission, the Confessor, provided that he does not thereby give occasion for suspicion regarding the heard confession, can lawfully flee from the knowledge received through confession, so as to free himself from danger; for then (he says), no harm threatens the penitent, but only the manifestation of the denied permission is present before himself.

Tamen id minime admittendum puto; nam licet absit gravamen poenitenti, adest tamen indirecta saltem revelatio notitiae in Confessione habitae. But here it is decreed that if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can suitably be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, which, if a Confessor be chosen for a

supplement, can suitably be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Chapter III. Dub I. Of the Accessories of Penance. Cap. 2, Reg. prax., num. 1. Namely, if a Penitent should be chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; for if a Confessor knows someone from confession to have been accustomed to commit many sins or to have had a weak disposition, he will not be able without just cause to hide himself or excuse himself to that person when it appears before others and they are thereby given such suspicion, much more so if the penitent considers this as an implicit reproach of his own sins; but rather (he says) if no one should appear, because then no suspicion would arise in others.

But to this last point I do not agree, because if another Confessor were already in the confessional place and hence withdraws himself, seeing the penitent approaching, even though others saw nothing amiss, it seems nevertheless that he thereby imposes a burden on him and makes Confession somehow odious, since then the penitent would believe that, if a Confessor were chosen for the supplement, his Confession could be properly confirmed through another three years after the supplement time, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is strictly to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one. For which reason, if a Confessor were chosen for the supplement, it would indeed be properly confirmed by another three years after the supplement time, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is strictly to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one; and if he himself had not confessed there, he would fulfill his Confession with that same Confessor, as he desires. Et hoc magis est verendum post decreta, ubi prohibentur Confessarii ullo modo uti notitia Confessionis ad externam gubernationem, aut cum aliquo gravamine penitentis; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; quidem intelligitur, ut inquit idem 6 cum S: Thoma, Lugo, Unde ex ipsa Roncag. dico, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; licet tunc fuga illa ex praetextu apparenter justo non redderet Confessionem odiosam tali

penitenti, redde ret tamen odiosam generaliter Reipublicae Christianae, quia si scire it fidele; possis Confessarios ex colorato praetextu adfigere ab ipsis; obnotitiam in Confessione accejtam aurum peccatorum, facile gravarentur. Eject therefore the confessor who shall hide himself if he have a just cause; on account of which presumptuous excuse he equally justified being heard for other unknown penitents. It does not hinder, if a penitent is suspected to have chosen to conceal himself as confessor on account of heard sins; for if indeed the confessor excuses himself on account of just cause, then his suspicion would truly be rash, which the confessor ought not to fear. Hence, if a penitent be elected for a supplementary period, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, to be received in regard to ordinary election, not supplementary. For if such a penitent were presumed to suspect the confessor of hiding himself on account of the sins heard; for if indeed the confessor were truly excusing himself on grounds of justice, then his suspicion would truly be rash, which the confessor should endeavor to avoid not unreasonably.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. If someone were to be chosen as Confessor for the supplement, it could adequately be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict in terms of ordinary election rather than extraordinary election. If a penitent, being indisposed, threatens the Confessor over the denial of absolution, then the Confessor could rightly avoid him and not return, because such threats are not a sin manifest for obtaining absolution but a sin committed in confession itself. This flight is permitted to the Confessor only if it does not cast suspicion upon others of a denied absolution; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. if it should cast such suspicion, one could recite some prayer, not now with the intention of deceiving the penitent, but solely to obtain liberation from that trouble, although the penitent himself may be deceived by believing that prayer to be the form of absolution.

See what has been said about the Sacrament. This [work] 6 note 3g v. On the contrary. Doubtful. 66o. Whether, when the Confessor knows from the Confession that the Church is polluted, he can celebrate there? This case,

however, would occur with difficulty, for (as we have said in Book 6, n. 364) public pollution of the Church requires a public violation; nevertheless it could happen somehow, namely if the violation were indeed public, but unknown to the Confessor, or if others were unaware through such an act that the Church had been polluted. In those however cases the First Opinion, which Sporer and Bonaventure hold in the same title question 6 part 4 note 23 with Sylvester,

Lazar. et aliis dicit, quod possit et tenere confessarium celebrare. Reason, because the Church does not seem then to wish to oblige the Priest to refrain from celebrating in favor of the seal. The second opinion, which Lugo in Distinction 23 n. 125 and Aversa in part 6 n. 1976 holds, deems him unable to celebrate, because from one aspect there is a command not to offer sacrifice in a polluted Church, while from another it minimally commands the keeping of the seal when no danger of revelation exists for others, nor any risk of harm to the penitent's state. And hæc sententia videtur satis probabilis eam Mazzot pag. 589 si vere nullum sequatur poenitentis gravamen et nulla fiat Cap. III. Dub.

 indirect revelation, namely if the Confessor justly explains an alibi for celebrating elsewhere. Dubit. VI. Whether, if from the Confession you know that someone (to whom you were accustomed to confess) is not a Priest, nor is he a Confessor, you are able and bound to proceed to him for confession?

He denies it, and considers it probable. Thus indeed, you reveal nothing about the penitent's crime, since countless reasons can exist for changing the confessor. However, more commonly and correctly, Lugo opposes this in D, 23, n. 105. Mazzotta t. 3 n. 189. et Croix n. 1978. cum . et Stoz, ac praesumptum probabile censet Sporer 1. cit. Reason, because in such an omission, although there is no revelation seal, nevertheless always something odious to penance is present. Then it is not necessary for you to simulate the Sacrament (if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary; which, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary. In this case it would truly be intrinsically evil), but he can simply manifest some sin to a fictitious Priest or Confessor without an intention of absolution: if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement,

because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary. In this case, his cooperation with that sin would not have been illicit, since your cooperation in that sin would have been only material.

Furthermore, generally speaking, I say this: if a Confessor be elected for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be elected for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Let there always be great caution in this matter, which is so grave and perilous, lest penitents receive some unjust burden from Confession, as we observed at the beginning; yet all slight conjectures are not bound to be avoided, which malicious persons easily fabricate, but only that he furnish probable suspicions of the sins heard, as Lugo says D. 23 n. 106. with Scotus, Palatine, and Gob. Tambur. et Gorm. ex 13 ubi sic ait: Si amotio subditi ab administratione possit inducere ad manifestandum peccatum in confessione auditum, vel ad aliquam (nota) probabilem suspicionem habendam de ipsa, nullo modo prelatus deberet subdum removere. DOUBT II. What is the precept and what obligation does Confession have? To whom, and when does this precept oblige? And how is the time for Confession computed annually? Does the divine commandment of Confession oblige outside the hour of death? How does the vow of physicians not to visit the sick who have not confessed obligate?

See the presumed text book 3 n. 182. Who are bound by the precept of Confession? Are minors exempt? Whether these can be absolved if there is doubt about the use of reason ()? Whether one who has only venial sins is obliged to annual confession? Whether he who does not fulfill the precept is bound to do so as soon as possible? And whether by confession which takes place in the following year, satisfaction is made for the presumed precept of the preceding time? Whether there is an obligation to confess to one's own parish priest at Easter? Whether one must sometimes confess before the end of the year? Whether invalid confession satisfies the precept? Who are excused from this precept. Almost entirely in those who transgress this precept. 662. "Resp." The precept of confessing, both divine and ecclesiastical, obliges mortally all under penalty of mortal sin: that one at the point of death; this truly after they have reached the years of discretion: and in such a way that they confess to their own priest or

another with his permission once a year; computing from one confession to another, as some teach (Ut Sot. et Gran. 'ap. . Qu. 4 ar. 3 n. 4): either from the beginning of January to the end of December, as is commonly held); and they hold that C. ac Croix n. 2043.) or finally between two Pasches, according to a very established custom, for the Communio reason. . 35 s. 2 art. 2 Card. de Lugo d. 11 s. 3, 6 et 7. Coninck. d. 5 d. 6.

Chapter III. Doubt. Two. Penance with Accessories. 191 » Hence rightly it is said in no. 33, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, he can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, would, speaking properly, an year be reckoned from January to December, yet, according to general custom, it is computed beginning from Easter to Easter. » It is inquired whether the precept of confession binds sometimes outside of life's peril of death? Common is not to oblige immediately after sin; thus S. 3 art 1 q. 4, which follows, de Pœnit. c. 7 n. 5.

It is doubtful whether it obligates even slightly frequently in life? They likewise deny it, namely, Cajetan and Scotus, and also Boscobulus, as well as the Decretists according to Crouciange, lib. 6, p. 2, n. 2020. Reason, because such an obligation does not seem to be proven by any certain foundation, since a sinner can reconcile himself to God through contrition. But more commonly they affirm Victorinus in chapter c., namely in a similar precept, that is, of Communion; for since this divine commandment remains to be determined by Christ besides this (as we have said in note n. 437). Doubt i.), such a precept per accidens obligates the presumed sinner beyond the hour of Anno to Confession, if it is not removed, on account of charity toward himself, lest he remain for a long time in mortal sin.

Here incidentally to be dealt with the question concerning which we treated in the aforementioned note n. 182 of chapter 3, book 664. But this is more fully to be discussed: In what way are physicians bound to warn patients about confession? It must be known that if a penitentiary is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning the ordinary election and not the extraordinary one; for if a penitentiary is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning the ordinary election and not the extraordinary

one. The Lateran Council under Innocent [is the sentence translated literally]. III. In c. Cum infirmitas 13 de Pœn. et rem. præceperit districtè (nempe sub gravi, ut omnes interpretantur apud . 17. de omnibus Medicis, ne infirmos in suam curam recipiant, nisi priùs infirmi confiteantur.

Delndè S. Pius V. in Br: Motu proprio, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. incipit, Supra græ- gem, edito an. 1566, innovando præfatam Saucionem præcept. Let the physician begin to care for the sick, unless [he is authorized] according to Chapter 172. VI. Treatise. Fourth.

On the Sacrament of Penance. It admonishes him to make confession; and he must not go three days beyond without visiting him, unless the written Confession has already recorded him as having confessed. And that physicians, before they assume the degree of doctorate, may swear to observe this precept; and ordinaries will not admit them into their dioceses, unless it be established by this oath. Given these positions, it is enquired, concerning what sort of infirmity are these Decrees understood? Three are the sentences. First, which is held. 5 tr. 6 c. 5 n. 5. Likewise Rosol.

Grass. Vega, et d. c. 2 n. 90 (et hanc Ciera Diss. 21 cui adhaeret, vocat communiorem, sed immerito) dituit intelligi de solo morbo periculoso, vel saltem de quo dubitatur an sit periculosus. And the same is understood when he says: There is no room for warning when it is evident that the disease is not perilous. And in this sense they add that the aforementioned Decrees have been received as applicable. Secondly, however, they hold the opinion which is expressed by 5.

Aulton, 3 p. t. 7 c. 2 § 4 Sylv. v. Medirus § Tertium; dictio intelligi de quocumque morbo, praesumptum non mortali. Reason, because concerning a dangerous disease, as a matter of natural law, it would have been advised to give the aforementioned warning; hence when in said chapter with regard to infirmity, a new precept is established, undoubtedly the text should not be understood solely of mortal infirmity. The third opinion is more common, which is held by thirty-five. Dec. 1. 3 c. 16 n. 7. 4 q. r p. 16 n. 'ro et i3 . 14.

D. pag. 7 § 4 num. 2 86 q. 5. . 4 art. 2 num. 4 . 3 tr. 4. R. 93 with Augustine. Arm. Table. Nunni. num. 90 cum Cajet. . XIV. hoc praeceptum non quidem intelligi de solis morbis periculosis; nam verissime Constitutio Innocentii edita fuit (ut exprimitur in dicto c. 13) ob motivum, ne infirmi, cum monerentur in morbo mortali, facilius mortis periculum incurrerent; unde praeceptum seu juramentum intelligendum est de facienda monitione praesumpta in morbo non periculoso, ut infirmi, cum monentur, non incurrant mortis periculum.

Dict 2, nor presumptuous, Cap. III. Doubt. II. On the Accessories of Penance. 173 It is understood concerning any light illness (if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which would be ridiculous, Suarez said), but concerning a serious illness, even if not dangerous. Reason, because Innocentius and S. Pius speak of those sick in bed, and therefore it is understood that they are speaking of that infirmity which the sick do not seek for greater convenience, as if laboring under gout or some similar affection, but rather from necessity, so that it is in itself grave, or prudently judged dangerous, so that it becomes grave. Nor otherwise do D. Antonin disagree with this judgment; and indeed their reason adduced proves nothing else than that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be understood from the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one, would be ridiculous; thus they do not say that it is advisable to admonish the sick in every light infirmity, but only affirm that it should be admonished in an infirmity even non-mortal, which we call grave.

Notant autem DD. I sufficere, ut Medicus moneat infirmum per alios; ita Mazzotta c. 3 p. 287 ac: 11. cc. cum Graff. Vega, Sufficere testimonium aliorum (absque Confessa- rii scripto), si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Infirmus sit confessus, modo sint fide digni; Sua. et Diana. cum Fil. Only. If any confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary one., that is, if any confessor be

chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary one.

A physician is not bound by such a warning, if morally he be certain that the patient is in a good state of health; so says S. Augustine. If a confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Rosel. Arm. . and with and . If a confessarius is chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessarius beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be accepted as such for ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones, if an invalid were unwilling obstinately to confess and were in the danger of death, then he is not bound to desert him; for the aforementioned Decrees are not contrary to charity which also favors the obstinate so far as it can be done; thus Diana, Conc., et Vega.

Benedictus dictavit hanc opinionem. XIV. Notif. 22 n. 17. esse communem Theologorum et Canonistarum cum Lugo, Palau Pirhüug. etc., circa. obligationem autem monendi infirmum de Confessione, stando quidem, rigori praeferatarum Constitutionum Innocentii et S. Pii, omnino videtur vera tertia sententia, docens monitionem esse faciendam, 174 Lib. VI. Treatise.

IV. On the Sacrament of Penance: not only when the disease is mortal, but also presumptuously with danger present, so that thereby a mortal might escape; for indeed the Pontiffs impose another new precept on the Medici besides that, namely if a Penitentiary should be chosen as supplement, he could be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Penitentiary beyond three years is so odious and strict to be held with reference to an ordinary choice, not an extraordinary one. They themselves hold this according to divine law. And fain would I that the aforesaid Constitutions were observed; for if so many infirm persons avoided damnation, much more grievous crimes would they commit with such penitents, and very far fewer souls would they incur perdition! For those Confessors who procrastinate Confession through the idleness of the Physicians, or who remain inconfessed, or who confess imperfectly—these latter die. But since the Decrees of the Pontiffs do not oblige, except if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after

the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this reason, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; for the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. They are thus received in practice according to Cajetan in Summa Verba. Medical sins, c. n. 14.

The rule of Triduum 16 chapter 3 number 22 with Victor and Scortia, and chapter 2 number 91 with Prado and Candido; hence they say, and others similarly cited, that said Decrees and oath do not oblige in Spain, because there they are not received in use, or have been abrogated. Likewise, Pius of Naples testifies (as I presume from having received it) that it is observed only in pernicious illnesses. « 1. They are bound by this precept. 1. Heretics, and Apodatia, children capable of fraud, at least after seven years. See Lugo loc. cit. sect. 7 n. 144 and 149. 2.

Entering perilous navigation, or a conflict. 3. Tender woman first to be in parturition, or which is wont to have difficult births. The defendant adjudged to death. 5. Who have signs of natural death. » Thus commonly: "titulus" q. 4 art. 2 n. 3. et Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 2019.

» with St. Thomas. '. . 15 n. 37. et cum . . 41. cum commun (contra Medi n., et Confessio, Ecclesiam non obligare ante pubertatem, cum anni Cap. III. Doubt. II. Regarding the Accessories of Penitence.. 175 « let them more readily reach the discretion, and may it be morally established, » that it is possible to sin during the ninth or tenth year, » nay rather, before.

Wherefore such a boy, even though lately he may be seen to understand God through this or that mystery of the sacrament and to show grief and intention, as well as the principal mysteries of faith, should be absolved; nevertheless, if it is not noted that there has been sufficient use of reason, he ought to be absolved with a condition (indeed, at the bedside of death he ought to be so absolved). V. . 5 t. 6 c. 5 de Lugo l. c. et d. 17 n. 22 ubi docet praesumptum extra articulum mortis et obligationem praecepti tale esse sub conditione absolvendum ne gratia sacramentalis privetur (vide dicta de hoc puncto n. 432.) He who has only venial sins is not obliged; nor does custom have him bound, and each one may be constrained even thus, that in Paschate he remain before the Pastor, so that with the rest he may be admitted to Communion, if some Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is accepted in regard

to ordinary election, not to extraordinary. For if some Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is accepted in regard to ordinary election, not to extraordinary. The Pastor is bound, if another says, that he is not conscious of a mortal sin. . 36 l. 2 etc. commonly. * (But Religious and Moniales are bound each month to Confession and Communion? See the aforementioned n. 313. v.

They say: Whether one who has no mortal sins is bound to confess venial sins in order to satisfy the precept of annual confession? The first opinion affirms this, and this is held by S. Bonaventura, V, q. 5, p. 4, n. 7) when he says: "By virtue of the Sacrament one is not bound to confess venial sins, but through the institution of the Church, when one does not have others which should be confessed." And considers it probable under IV. [distinction] concerning Innocence. III. In cap. Omnis de Poen. indistincte obligat fideles ad confitendum saltem semel in anno, et proinde etiam eos quì sola habent venialia. However, the second common and more truthful opinion denies it, and they hold this with Bus. et .

Lugdunensis d. 15 n. 132. Bon. 1. c. with 176 Lib. VI. Treatise. Fourth.

On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. Christus autem Cano nullam praecipit Confessionem, nisi peccata mortalium, ut explicat 5 ubi ait: Tamen venialia exi possint culpam. This is confirmed by the very words of the text in that chapter Omnis; where it says: Every faithful person should confess all his sins at least once a year. Note the word Omni-; therefore (as this Lugus well observes, "4. It is probable that him who in one year, whether with or without his own fault, did not fulfill the precept, should still be held as soon as possible in the following year, since the term is not set for ending an obligation, but for preventing its deferral.

And therefore to commit such a mortal sin so often as he neglects an offered opportunity, as Bonaventure teaches in d. 5 q. 5 s. 2 de contra (Vid. d. n. 297. de annus Communionis praecepto), if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary, which proceeds pari passu with the annual confession precept; there the affirmative sentences are adhered to, even though we have said that the negative sentence coincides with the teaching of St. Antoninus. Toleto, Sa, etc., qua hanc obligationem non agnoscit, non esse contemnendam). » Whether, however, by confession made in the following year, placed under

this obligation according to the aforementioned sententia, satisfaction of the precept of both years is thereby achieved? The first sentiment affirms this, and thus hold Lugo, d. 13, n. 180. The di-cast according to Salamanca canon 7 number 45. Reason, because the precept concerning confession is that it should be made once a year; therefore, he who has done this, is not bound to another in the same year.

Otherwise, he who has not been confessed for three years should confess four times. The second sentiment denies this, and they hold it by 36 seats. 4 n. 5. with the Concilium. Fill. et Nunno; quia congruent qui singulis annis tenetur solvere denarium, si anno praeterito non solvit, non satisfacit solvendo hoc anno unum denarium, ita non potest quis una confessione praecepto duorum annorum satisfacere. However, the third opinion is more correct, as Palau maintains on page 26 section 2 note 15. 4 a 3 note 5. and when he distinguishes it thus: If the penitent in Confession manifests mortal sins both of the preceding year and of the present year, then he satisfices the obligation of each of the two years well. Reason, because through that very one Confession he now fulfills the end of the precept, namely, that he himself be reconciled with God: which is contrary to the second opinion.

Nor does it hinder the equality of money brought; for the solution of one denarius cannot indeed be equal to the solution of two debts of denarii, but one confession can well be equal to many confessions, since one confession erases all the sins which would have been erased through many. Si vero poenitens in praesenti anno non peccavit mortaliter ante Confessionem, et postea incidit in mortale, tunc una Confessione non satisfacit praeceptis utriusque anni, sed tenetur iterum confiteri. Reason, because by that Confession he only satisfies the precept of the past year, and not of the present year, since in respect to the precept of the present year it does not satisfy, who does not confess mortal sins of this year; commonly do Doctors and Masters teach, as D. [Doctor] and M. [Magister] [do], according to c. n. 41 with Diana, Hurt. 15 n. 173: if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, should not be strictly interpreted in extraordinary elections. If someone confesses only venial sins at the beginning of the year, and commits mortal sin before the end, he is bound to confess that within the same year. Wherefore, since that Confession concerning mortal sins does not suffice for the fulfillment of the precept of the present year in the preceding year, it follows that if a penitent is chosen as a supplement, his confession can be properly confirmed through another three years following the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against

choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is to be strictly and odiously interpreted concerning ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. Thus, if the penitent commits some mortal sin in this year before its end, he must confess it before the end of the year. «.5. Those who confess to Mendicants on Easter presume, because they have the faculty from St. Thomas, VI. 178 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. Of the Sacrament of Penance. the very most holy priest of all the faithful, and Shepherd of shepherds.

Ita communiter omnes contra Glossatum-rem, et Auctorem Parochiani obedientis, Contra quos vid. in Responsis Francisci Fontani, editis Vienne Austriae anno 1634 allegatam auctoritatem duorum Concil. Commonly. Vienna, and Trent, 20. Pontificium, 50 doctorum, et praeter totius orbis consensum, multorumque parochorum testationum, eos esse optimos parochiani, qui regulares adeunt, et ab his instituuntur, ut supra l. 3 t. 3 c. 1 dub. 3 item Navarr. . . 3 c. 4 d. 2 n. 6. * (Vide dicta de hoc puncto n. 564.) * 671 6. He is not bound before the end of the year who having regard to the time fears lest he forget that.

Coin. Henry. C. de Lugo, n. 41, and others against Med., etc. Si tamen praevideret se non habiturum occasionem confitendi deinceps totius hujus anni; deberet praevire praesumptum in medio aestatis. Card. de Lugo disp. 15 sect. 6. 182 (Vide dicta n. 298.) 672 7. It is more probable that the requirement of the Church's precept be not fulfilled through invalid confession, as they teach in d. 36 s. 7.

Filius. . de Lugo d. 15 s. 6 § 5 etsi putet esse contrarium probabile. It is improbable now on account of proposition 14 among those condemned by Alexander VII. * Also, not even through confession of venial sins, as it is taught in tome 4, page 206, from Hurtado and at the end.) * 673 8. They are excused from this precept who physically cannot do so, for example those to whom a confessor is lacking. They are also excused who morally cannot do so; for example, those who prudently fear the revelation of the seal, or those who cannot without notable inconvenience to life, fortune, etc. Con. c. 4 § 3. 674 Nota in fine si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. De Jure communi ex cap. Om- nis utrius q. sexus, duplex poena incurratur à trans- gredientibus tale praeceptum, scilicet prohibitio ab ingressu Ecclesiæ, et privatio sepulture; sed ineut Cap. III. Appendix concerning confessors who solicit. It is reckoned after the sentence of the Judge.

And minors are exempted from the said punishment. * (Ita. q. 4 ar. 3 n. g. See d. 295 v. Precept.) * Appendix. On confessors who importune. According to the bull issued by Gregory XV in the year 1622 and described at page 17, the following must be denounced: All... priests (words from the bull) whether regulars or seculars, who have presumed to pervert any persons whatsoever in an honest manner, either amongst themselves or with others as they please, through acts of sacramental confession, either before, after immediately, or by occasion or pretext of confession... without following confession, or outside the opportunity of confession, in a confessional, or at any other place where confessions are heard, or to be heard for confession, and who have attempted to simulate there listening to confessions, or have conversed with them about illicit and dishonest matters. And subsequently it is added: Commanding all confessors that they inform their penitents whom they have known to have been solicited by others, as mentioned above, about the obligation of denouncing such solicitors or treaters, etc. To inquisitors, or to the ordinaries of places, etc. And if they shall have neglected this duty, let the Pontiff command that they be punished according to the mode of the fault.

In edictu autem generalis Inquisitionis imponitur excommunicatione late sententiæ in non denuntiantes infra mensem omnes de haeresi suspectos, inter quos confessores sollicitantes ad turpia enumerantur. Concerning this excommunication to be declared, see no. 693. Here it refers to noting authors whom I have observed treat the topics concerning this matter of solicitation, with an indication of passages. There are four from Faith d. 9, 6 de oblig. denunc. p. 3, 47 c. 29. Felix per totum.

Mazz. eod. tit. t. 3 ex p. 435, Caeterum 280 Lib. VI. Tract. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. Few authors have dealt with this matter expressly, perhaps because the aforementioned Bull of Gregory has not been received everywhere as asserted by Anacl. n. 67 de Germania, Palau de Hispania.

But this must be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can appropriately be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict, being understood thus of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can appropriately be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict, being understood thus of ordinary election, not extraordinary. N. SS. P. Ben. XIV. Last but not least in the year 1741 June issued a Bull which begins "Sacramentum," by which he confirmed and, as needed, anew commanded all Inquisitors and

Ordinaries of all places throughout the entire Christian world to inquire and proceed against all Priests solicitous of any dignity, preeminence, etc. § I. The Clauses appended to the aforementioned Bull of Gregory XV are examined. De clause I. 676.

In the act of the sacramental Confession. Before or immediately after. 678 Concerning clause III. Occasion, or pretext of Confession. What does it signify to you, on the occasion of confession? Dub. 1.

Whether one must denounce him who solicits a woman who seeks confession, that he may hear her tomorrow? Dub 2. Who, after hearing about the woman's weakness, later at home solicits her? 679 What does it matter to you, by means of the pretext of Confession? And what if, from a woman who has spoken falsehoods, pretending to be sick, she lures the confessor to sin? Regarding clause IV. In Confessionarius, aut in loco quocumque... simulantes ibidem Confessions auditur.

What does that imply for those who pretend? And what if the Confessor solicits the confessions of the penitent without simulation, yet without genuine confession? CLAUSTRALIA. In the act of the sacramental Confession, it is sufficient for this purpose if the Confession has been commenced, even though it be not completed: so c. 4 n. 44 and Ronc, de pænit. Question 8, chapter 1, question 4.

Note here Prop. VI. The damned one from whom he said: "Confessor, who after having granted a penitential charter in the sacramental confession, permits it to be read afterwards, so as to be incited to devotion, is not considered solicitous in the confession." Similarly, a confessor is equally to be denounced if in confession he appoints an indifferent medium; if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Nevertheless, from circumstances afterward known, the appointment might be considered suitable to induce solicitude, so that it would be imposed upon a woman that she await him at home; or if he questions her where she dwells; thus Ronc, d. l. cum Bordon, Cap. III. Appendix concerning confessors soliciting. Clause 10: II. Immodet ante, vel post.

That which is imme-diately after, commonly understood by PP., when after Confession neither the Confessor nor the penitent turns to other matters, so that solicitation occurs before any other action intervenes;

thus, after the penitent has withdrawn from the sight of him. However, the penitent himself rightly considers it proper to be denounced, who, immediately after the confession, has experienced some slight temptation, and afterwards, with a certain interval having elapsed, solicits; even if, admitting this, he had previously seriously treated another affair, because then such a treatment is presumed to have been prudently made: otherwise, if he comes on the following day and solicits: thus However, some learned persons do not consider it altogether improbable that if a confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a different confessor beyond three years is so odious, strict, and to be understood as referring to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. For in such a case, although the confessor need not be denounced according to the aforementioned clause, yet he ought to be denounced according to the following third clause: on account of the confession; for if the confessor makes use of that petition merely as a means to solicit, then undoubtedly he should be denounced; otherwise, if he uses it only to converse with the penitent, and afterwards in the course of conversation seeks to solicit. Wherefore, judging from the circumstances, whether the solicitation and business were intended principally, as a means; or rather the business was principal, and the solicitation accidental. It is certain that the confessor ought to be denounced if, immediately after confession, he leads a boy into the bedroom and solicits; because then, without delay, he establishes himself if he does not solicit. VI.

Treatise. IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance: regarding the license, at least that medium? Thus question 6 and also, if upon hearing the confession of a woman, while she approaches to kiss the hand, the Confessor rudely touches her; or if he does so while she is before him, urging her to confess with his feet or hands; if she immediately afterwards kisses them without any further fault, both are likewise to be denounced. If however she confesses again in another way, see what is to be said in Clause III. Occasion or pretext of Confession.

It is called an occasion of confession when the confessor or penitent invites to true confession: through a pretext, however, when he invites to false confession: thus, according to Potestas n. 109. . 7 et Et i. From a particle of occasion of confession, the confessor is to be denounced who, having been asked to confess, turns aside from confession and solicits, provided that he has not yet sat down, nor has the woman still knelt; thus commonly. Power no. 510 at the end, and Ronc., same work, and Dubit., i. Whether a Confessor ought to be denounced who, being asked by a woman that he might receive her confession tomorrow, exhorts and urges her, though she

has not yet sat down nor knelt? Asserting on page 439 with Potestas and others, because it is now verified by the occasion of solicitation in her confession.

They however deny it according to Mazz., because such solicitation is not proximate to the making of a confession, but rather to a convention concerning the making of a confession. But this does not hinder the solicitation from being called an occasion of confession. Therefore, I subscribe to the first opinion. Doubt. 2. Whether a Confessor should be denounced who, out of weakness for the woman heard in her confession, later at home has entreated her?

The first opinion denies it, and this is held by Sousa de Conf. soll. n. 10 and others cited by Diana p. 4 tr. 5. R. 7, et idem Leander sentit; et idem est sensus authoris libri (Istruz. per li Nov). Reason, because at that time he does not make use of the occasion of Confession, but knowledge derived from it; hence then the Confessor is said to sin not on account of the occasion, but on account of knowledge of Confession, since the solicitation is remote from the place and condition of Confession. Second Chapter III: Appendix on Solicitous Confessors. However, the opinion affirmed is more probable, and this is held by the Power [of the Church], n. 504 at the end, and n. 587. Peyr. with c. and et Bord.

Reason, because, when solicitation has obtained an impulse from Confession, it is sufficiently verified if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, and may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, offers an occasion. Let there be a solicitation for confession. Satis autem praesumitur Confessarius usum fuisse notitiae Confessionis ad sollicitandum, si post auditam peccata turpia poenitentis et suamque propensionem ad venerem ostensam interroget de domo quibu habitat, an maneat sola, et similia; vel (ita se citat) si Confessarius sollicitet per epistolam; vel si Confessarius obtineat vel petat à muliere consensum copulae, promittendo ejus Confessionem se auditurum. The Confessor is to be denounced under the pretext of confession who invites a woman to confession with an evil intent and subsequently solicits her; Conc. num. 8. Mazz. d. p. 439 et q. 7 cum Bord.

If however the Confessor goes to solicit a woman, seeking permission from his Superior under the pretext of Confession, they say justly in conclusion: But when should the Confessor be denunciated who agrees with the woman that he pretend to be ill at home for the purpose of avoiding

domestic matters, and thereby invite himself to come home to confess a sin? Cono. and Mazz. affirm likewise in books three and five, and Sancius in four treatises, fifth chapter. R. 37 quia praetextus confessionis tune videtur satis manifestus. But they deny probabiliis, in question 7 at the end, with Bord. Diana l. o. et cum Freita, ac Leand.

Reason, because then it would not be verified if a Confessor were chosen as a supplement, he could well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood, inasmuch as odious and strict with regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, which means that if a Confessor were chosen as a supplement, he could well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood inasmuch as odious and strict with regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. Confessor solicits under pretext of Confession, but only if some Confessor is elected for supplementarily, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be understood in relation to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, since, if some Confessor is elected for supplementarily, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be understood in relation to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, praetextu Confessionis peccatum exequatur; ita ut praetextus Confessionis tunc jam ordinetur non ad sollicitationem, sed i84 Lib. IV. Treatise. Fourth.

Of the Sacrament of Penance: for deceiving family members. And I think it should be all the more (contrary to Coincinam) that the Confessor should be denounced if a woman, without any preliminary agreement, under pretense. He shall advocate and solicit confession itself, although they may subsequently possess it; because then the Confessor must be denounced according to the Bull when he himself solicits on the pretext of confession; but in this case not the Confessor, rather the penitent solicits the Confessor on the pretext of confession. I deem it proper to speak otherwise, if the confessor solicited outside the confession, and a woman declined fearing slander; and therefore the confessor exhorted her, pretending to entice her to sin by an agricultural pretext; because then truly the confessor would be said to solicit the woman through the pretext of confession to give consent. I deem it proper to say that if a Confessarius be called by a mother on behalf of her daughter so that he may receive the daughter's Confession, and he himself approach the daughter's chamber with an evil intent to speak to her about the Confession, namely, by asking whether she wishes

to confess herself or to say that she had been called by him for her Confession, and subsequently solicits her; because then he would be presumptuously soliciting under the pretext of Confession.

I think it should be said similarly when and where Diana d. R. 37 states that if the Confessor, in a place appointed for confessions, and under the guise or semblance of confession, seeks to hear confessions with an eye to this end, and solicits; then he must be reported not now because he solicits under the pretext of confession, but because he solicits by pretending to be at the place appointed for confession itself, as we shall say in due course number seq. 68o 'Clause IV.' Outside the occasion of Confession, in the confessional or in any place where Confessions are heard, or when selected to hear Confessions, those who shall attempt to solicit Confession there, or to provoke and entice, or shall have held with them illicit and shameful conversations or conferences, shall be denounced accordingly. To those who simulate the hearing of confessions there, namely is understood if a priest conducts himself in such a way that those present believe that he is actually hearing the confession. They say in n. 675 with others, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is to be understood odiously and strictly regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, for the purpose of simulating confession. Chapter III. Appendix concerning those solicitous for confessors. 181 It is not sufficient if a woman assists at the Confessional with bent knees; but furthermore it is required that the confessor simulate hearing the confession by voice, gesture, or some action, as when applying oil; because (as they say) simulation ought not only to be on the part of penitents; but also presumptuously on the part of confessors, since in the Bull regarding this matter it is stated: "Those who pretend to hear confessions there."

But Diana R. 18 and Fagund. more approve this, namely, that if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary one, for the purpose of simulating Confession according to the Chapter III. Therefore she should confess this very thing; consequently, she herself already by fact pretends that she hears Confession. However, I think it should be said otherwise, if at any place, although elected for Confession, the Priest solicited a woman who was standing, seated, or lying; according to what is about to be said.. I said, outside the Confessional, because a doubt arises here: whether the Confessor who solicits ought to be denounced; or vile matters are treated in the Confessional, although Confession is being

simulated? The first assertion denies this, and thus n. 669 and the Ratio hold; because in the Bull of Gregory, as stated above, it is declared that those Confessors are to be denounced who outside the occasion of Confession enter into the Confessional or any place where Confessions are heard, or who, having been elected for Confession, pretend there to hear Confessions; and who have attempted to solicit or provoke such persons, or have held illicit and dishonorable discourse with them. Therefore they infer that if a penitentiary is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Hence, whether solicitation occurs within the penitentiary or at another place chosen for confessions, a requirement exists for denouncing the simulation of confession. But they more probabily affirm that it ought to be denounced 4 R. 18 et p. 4 tr. 5 R. 38 et p. 8 tr. 9 R. 35 ac Trull: etc. With these 186 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. Regarding the Sacrament of Penance, we say that if a penitent is chosen as an additional confessor for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three-year period after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted more strictly regarding ordinary than extraordinary election. If the penitent solicits in two other places as described above in the Bull; confession must be simulated to report him; but if he merely solicits for a confessor, this does not apply. And this is proven from the Decree.

Pauli V. (relato apud Pot. I. c.) where it was thus stated: on the tenth day. July 1614. in the General Congregation. S. Rom.: et universalis Inquisitionis coram PP. Paulo Papa V., fatta la relazione: si bene possa confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary; quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary. multi Confessarii tractare cum mulcibribus in confessionale extra occasionem confessionis de rebus inhonestis: Sanctissimus decrescit, ut contra hujusmodi Confessarios procedatur in s. officio; Cum igitur nulla ibi fiat mentio de simulatione confessionis ad denuntiandum confessarium, sufficit, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de

electione ordinaria, non extraordinary., quod ipse in confessionale de rebus turpibus tractet, quin simulat, se confessorem audire.

It does not hinder to say, as their adversaries claim, that this Decretum was abrogated or restricted by a Bull of Gregory. For it is answered that the general rule holds, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. the former laws are never understood to be abrogated by the latter ones; unless when these are completely contrary to the prior ones; otherwise, always and in some way. A contrariety may be excused, a correction of laws, if aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. it may happen that such a contrariety should be avoided, prevented according to common errat Sanc. de Matr. I. 1. d. 17 n. 6. tr. 3 d. 5 p. 2 § 1 n. 8. tit. c. 4 n. 13. et alii Decretales passim ex capite Cum delectus, de Consuetudinibus, et ex I. I Causae de Deinoff. When it is said: That laws be in harmony with one another is readily achievable. The Decretum of Paul V. is well-suited in conjunction with the Bull of Gregory; for in the former speech it is discussed how matters concerning the confessional are treated unethically within the confessional; but in the Bull of Gregory an addition is made regarding the treatment of things that are turpitude, beyond the confessional, at any place where confessions are heard or where one chooses to hear confession, and here a clause is appended: those who pretend to hear confessions there.

Wherefore, since this clause can be rightly applied solely to two later places, and to confessing in confessionals, it matters not that we say otherwise. Decreto Pauli V. per Bullam Gregorii fuisse derogatum; Accedit edictum S. Inquisitionis 2, n. 226, ubi dicitur: Debbana Cap: III. Appendix concerning confessors who solicit. 189 Each one shall renounce whoever knows or has information that against Apostolic Decrees and Constitutions have abused the Sacrament of Penance by employing Confession for an unholy purpose, soliciting penitents in them to shameful deeds, and having

with them conversations about things illicit and not consonant with the purpose for which it was instituted. Wherefore such a Confessor is at least to be denounced by this edict, because he abuses and solicits in confession. ## § II. ## To whom do those solicitors owe denunciation? 681 Qu. I.

Whether a confessor who consents to solicitation should be denunciandus according to this edict? 682 Qu. II. Whether the Confessor, who is solicited regarding coition, turns aside to touch? 683 Qu. III. Whether a confessor, being solicited to venially culpable acts, permits only those that are unseemly? 684 Qu.

IV. Does he who solicits for sins that are not detestable? 685 Qu. V. Does the soliciting bishops for denunciations? 686 Qu. VI.

A confessor accused of solicitation, if he has been corrected, would it be appropriate to denounce him? 687 Qu. VII. Is he who has already been convicted and punished regarding solicitation? What. VIII.

To whomsoever consents to a woman's solicitation, lest he be accused by her? What. IX. A counterfeit confession from a promise made for dishonorable reasons? X. An simulantem confessionem ex condito ad tractanda inhonesta?

Is a layman to be denounced, or a cleric soliciting confession, simulating himself to be the confessor? And what...if he is a Priest but lacks jurisdiction? 689 Qu. XI. Does he who earnestly urges and recommends that someone be denounced deserve to be denounced? 699 Qu. XII.

Whether the interpreter to be denounced, while solicitously urging the culprit, is liable? 691 Qu. XIII. Is the confessor, by soliciting a woman, leading her to commit sin with another? Or that she herself commit sin with another? 692 Qu. XIV.

Whether the confessor anxiously inquires after the one who has died? Question. I. Whether the confessor is to be denounced to his superior by a solicitous woman. In confession?

All ir rant Lib. VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance, where it is explicitly stated that not only those who are disposed to Confession but also those who have unholy treatises on the subject are to be denounced; and the same opinion holds true, as expressed in no. 54, when Acunna and Hurt concur.

Sousa, et Sanctarella. item Prado, Bordon. c. Ac Sanctarell. etc. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. rationi à . And Resolution 4.1. approves this probable and safe statement. There occurs to me a great reason in favor of the said sentence, which is found among the writings of Bonac., and which seems more weighty. Reason is that from the Bull itself; hence it is inferred that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can fittingly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, a penitent lawfully might, if he wished, denounce a Confessor in that case, according to the probable first sentence; but it seems more probable that he would not be obliged to do so; for it is required that there be solicitation on his part for the denunciation of the Confessor. Even though the Confessor is not removed from the crime for an improper agreement in the office of Confessor, the penitent is nonetheless excused from the obligation of denouncing, provided that no solicitation is found to have been made.

And rightly is it held that the Pope did not intend to obligate penitents to denounce confessors whom they themselves have tried, out of great difficulty which deters penitents from denouncing in this case, where the sin itself would be the cause; moreover, because if they were to denounce, their reputation would suffer greatly; moreover, then an excessively harsh law would be imposed upon them. Some Neophyte has written that the aforementioned opinion was previously prescribed by Benedict XIV through a Bull titled Sacramentum, allatam t. 1 p. 35. But falsely did he assert this, Chapter III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. 189 nam Pontifex ibi tantum dixit, denunciationem esse faciendam etiamsi inter Confessarium et ponientem mutua fuerit. However, mutual solicitation is widely different from that which occurs between a woman and one to whom the Confessor consents, inasmuch as the Doctors very carefully distinguish the first case from the second, as can be seen where they say that mutual solicitation occurs thus: when the Confessor, solicited by the ponee, directs himself toward one vileness of vice, and then solicits a lower (mutilior) vice for another woman (as will be said later), or when he dissents or turns aside from the solicitation by the ponee; and afterward waits some interval before soliciting her again; and in these cases certain authors, such as Castr., consider it an act of mutual consent.

Peyr. et Acuna sententiauerunt, non esse obligationem denunciandi; et hæc

est opinio quæ à Pontifice damnata fuit: et quidem justè; in his casibus enim jam verificatur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria; pænitens verè maneat sollicitata; et verè Confessarius sollicitat; at in nostro casu cum Confessarius simpliciter sollicitationi consentit minimè verificatur, nec dici potest si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria; mulier sit sollicitata. When however cooperation of the Confessor is to be called simple consent, or presumptuous mutual solicitation; this depends on the circumstances of the discourse, and the treatise which intervenes between the Confessor and the penitent. Question NoneII. Whether the Confessor is to be denounced who, solicited by the penitent to engage in copulation, refused and diverted to mere touching?

Asserting with part. 5 n. 4. and n. 39. Reason, because a woman soliciting to copulation virtually provokes him who is presumptively inclined toward touchings, which are ordinariwise before viii to copulation; whence it is verified that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict and to be understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, because if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict and to be understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Confessarius (ut supra) tunc non sollicitet, sed sollicitatus consentiat. Correctly however notes n. 36: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can indeed be confirmed through another triennium following the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, that, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can indeed be confirmed through another triennium following the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Confessor solicitus ad sodomiam, si ipse convertatur in fornicationem vel contrarium, certè debet denunciari tibi, cum ipse tunc solicitus sit ad actum quem non fuerat solicitus; quia neque fornicatio continentur sub sodomia nec contra.

III. Whether the confessing priest should be denounced for soliciting only for venially dishonorable acts? The first opinion affirms, and this is held by Diana R. 5. . 7. damn. from Alexander VII. and . Leand. et Ratio, quia actus leviter inhonesti extra Sacramentum funt graves in Sacramento, ob gravem injuriam, quam ei irrogatur; congruent sumptio parvi cibi in die jejunii esse per se leve peccatum contra temperantiam, sed esset grave si fieret ante Communionem. The second however opinion is more probable and denies this; and those hold it with Sousa and Portell: and Sousa, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict is understood in reference to ordinary election, and not extraordinary; an act of solicitation is a grave sin so that it is certain that one has grievously sinned therein; since such a person should be denounced as suspect of faith, as is stated in the edict of the Inquisition on p. 430: no one can be considered suspect of faith who sins only venially.

Here follows B. XIV. This crime of solicitation calls for nefarious impiety; and in the Bull of Pius IV it is said concerning such priests who solicit, that instead of dealing with reconciliation with God they burden the penitent with a heavier mass of more grievous sins, and deliver them into the hands of the Devil. From another point of view, an act which in itself is slight against chastity cannot become grave in the Sacrament; otherwise, a venial sin regarding the matter of truthfulness, patience, or humility would be made grave in the Sacrament if some Confessor were chosen as a supplement. Indeed, the prohibition on not choosing a Confessor beyond three years can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when it comes to ordinary election rather than extraordinary; no one asserts this or objects to saying that if some Confessor were chosen as a supplement, it could be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition on not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict in the case of an ordinary election rather than extraordinary; for then a light fault might become grave out of respect due to the Sacrament; this occurs when something is prohibited merely out of reverence for the Sacrament, as it is prohibited for any small omission before Communion; but not when some matter is forbidden by the Church because it is essentially evil, since in that case the whole injury done to the Sacrament arises from the fact that a Sacrament is ministered or received with an improper act, and if the act is slightly depraved, it remains light according to Cap. III. Appendix concerning confessors who are solicitous.

It will be presumption to do an injury which is done to the sacrament. All nevertheless agree with Palao, and Escob.

II. cc., si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si ex circumstantiis certe conjicerefur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. The priest having by a slight act of will determined to proceed further, then his solicitation is considered to be serious. Questio. IV. Whether the Confessor should be denounced, who in confession urges the penitent not towards vile sins but to other kinds of sins, according to 684?

The first opinion affirms this, and Pego, Zechius, Moura, and Acunna uphold it according to 4 R. 17, and with this are inclined also Cord. The reason is, first, because in the Bull it says that he should be denounced who has illicit and dishonorable dealings with a penitent; and by illicit deals, it seems to comprehend all other acts of culpability except for matter that is dishonest; this seems to be more expressed in the edict of the Inquisition, where it is prescribed that those should be denounced who have illicit discourse with penitents not suitable to the end for which the Sacrament of Penance was instituted. Because in the Decree it is stated that all lightly suspected of heresy are to be denounced; therefore if one who solicits to turpitude is to be denounced as a suspect of heresy, why not also one who solicits to other crimes and sins? This sentence seems sufficiently probable, whereupon truly he says that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict in the matter of an ordinary election, but not extraordinary, which if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and

strict in the matter of an ordinary election, but not extraordinary. Inquiritori probabiliter cognoscere possint de hujusmodi sollicitatione, si deferatur, ob facultatem ipsis concessam.

The second opinion, however, most common and more probable denies it, and this they maintain on page 430. with Carena, Diana d. R 17. with Freita, Peyr. Man. Sousa, et Veneto, ac cum Fag. Leander, for it is true that in the Bull of Gregory, besides the word "inhonestos," "illicitos" is also added; nevertheless, it is clear that both signify the same matter when it is said that they are treated as "illicitos" and "inhonestos." The words of the edict are to be understood no otherwise, because the edict relates to the bull, or certainly to chapter 796 Lib.

VI. Treatise. IV. Referral concerning the Sacrament of Penance is made. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; because one suspected of heresy and presumed to commit other crimes might have solicited. For commonly the Doctors (as we have seen) interpreting the Bull of Alexander hold that there is no obligation to denounce such soliciters, since Bulls both of Gregory and other Pontiffs speaking of solicitation in Confession preceded only in denouncing those soliciting turpia; hence it seems that the obligation has been imposed for this very matter alone of denouncing soliciters, because by reason of the frailty of human nature more frequently this kind of solicitation and greater danger of consenting to it may occur.

That is confirmed by the practice of Instructors, as Diana says in the same place. Moreover, commonly do the Doctors say and with reason that there is no obligation to denounce Priests soliciting to turpitude in other Sacraments than Penance, because truly concerning this denunciation obligation nowhere is any precept found; thus Bonac. par. 3 n. 7. Diana R. 16. cum Freita, Acunna, et Sancio, ac cum Lez. Peyr. Sanctarell. etc. against Moura, and Hurt.

Querer. V. Are the bishops soliciting for denunciation during confession? They deny it and with Mol. Acunna, sessio 24, caput 5 de Ref., ubi dicitur: Causae criminales graviora contra Episcopos, praesumptum haeresis... ab ipsa tantum.

They are known and ended by the Roman Pontiff. But they affirm that it is better to inform the Pontiff, if a convenient denunciation can be made;

otherwise, that this should be referred to Inquisitors, who although they cannot punish nor form a process against Bishops, can nevertheless receive information about the aforementioned crime and then convey that to the Pontiff according to Cap. III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. 195 significare, prout colligitur ex Extravagantiis cum et in hoc conveniunt . II. cc. cum . quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria benè possint Inquisitores excipere hujusmodi informatio-nem. By the name of Bishops come Bishops presumed titulars, and presumed but non-consecrated; let them be merely confirmed now; likewise messengers, legates, and abbots having jurisdiction quasi episcopal, as they say when .

Question. VI. Whether, if the Confessor solicitously asks for the communication, he should still be denounced? The first opinion denies it, and those who hold this view agree with Soto and Molf. Accuna, Pyrr.

Fag. Portal. Lugo, Hurtad. and others suppose (perhaps extrinsically) that the Reason is probable for this (namely), because the end of denunciation is the remedy of the thing, and the removal of harm, which having already been obtained, ceases with the cessation of the principal law's end; hence the supposed natural law of denunciation, which principally regards remediation, also ceases; nor can a positive law invert that order. He considers this probable as a presumption. Q. 8, Art. 5, n. 3. Recte vero DD. excipiunt haereticum formalis, maxime dogmatizantem cuius difficultas est emendatio et quem omnino expedient denunciari saltèm ad subventionem aliorum quos ipse fortasse subjicerit.

The signs of repentance are said to be (as the cited Doctors say both in and outside of it): 1. If a woman, after being urged three or four times to approach the Confessional, does no longer observe that evil disposition in going to it; thus with regard to . 2. If the Confessor shall have lived well for a space of three years, as Sanctius says. 3. If there is confessed sacrament, and for a long time he has not tempted it, as Escobar in cap. n. 625 with Freitas, Sancio, 4. If he has gained from the Jubilee, as stated in 1494 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Four. On the Sacrament of Penance. Dictated by Escob with Genuensis. 5. If a Religious has become such.

If a man notable for virtue has once or twice solicited, so that a usurer may be exhorted. If after solicitation it immediately shows signs of sorrow.

8. If he had been an old man, such that it could be supposed from much suffering that he had solicited with great passion, and afterwards truly repented, as says Sylvester. These signs however are said: 1 single one is not sufficient to demonstrate amendment unless many together conjoined show it clearly. And this is very much to be noted; for truly, it is congruent that a crime should be such that its amendment also is manifestly evident.

And if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, is said in reference to solicitation; presumptuousness should be said concerning other crimes. Regarding suspects of heresy. Though the aforementioned first proposition is held to be sufficiently probable by the cited Authors, I nevertheless judge the second proposition to be more absolutely probable, which teaches that a Confessor, even though amended, ought to be denounced. Reason, because the Pontiff more aims at the punishment of the thing than its amendment, for reparating damage to the Church and for restoring scandal. And therefore he sanctioned, as stated above, that a denunciation be made without any fraternal correction preceding it; which would also have to be presupposed if the intent were primarily toward amendment of the matter and not its punishment. And indeed they add with many, that this second sentiment ought certainly to be held. 63, Question None

VII. Whether there is an obligation to denounce a Confessor who has already been sufficiently convicted and punished for solicitation? It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for an ordinary election, not for an extraordinary one; if himself he should have sinned repeatedly, after having been punished in a previous crime, he should be denounced anew. And likewise it must be said, if he has not been fully convicted of solicitation, because then he would also not have been sufficiently punished. Therefore, a doubt arises, if the same solicitation has already been sufficiently convicted and punished.

They deny that there is an obligation to denounce Acunna, c. 4 n. 73, because the Confessor is already considered amended according to the first mentioned sentence just above. But much more probable they affirm with Bon. Trui, Chapter III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. 196 emendatione; tum quia non eximitur mulier a obligatione denunciandi, quia alia denunciavit, dum unaquaeque persona sollicitata omnino

denunciare tenetur, sive sint sive non sint alii denuntiantes. Inquire.

VIII. Whether a Confessor should be denounced for consenting to a solicitous woman out of fear of being reproached by her, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement after the term of the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three years post the time of the supplement, because the prohibition regarding not selecting a Confessor beyond three years is, insofar as it is odious and strict, to be understood of an ordinary election, not of an extraordinary one; thus, he who is accused should be considered innocent unless he consents. The judges, indeed, do not readily believe anyone accusing a trivial woman, as they say in the Question None. IX. Whether the Confessor is to be denounced who, with the penitent present, simulates confession in order to treat unseemly matters.

He denies this then because the solicitation would then be mutual; and he denies it again because then the penitent himself ought to confess. But truly rightly affirming with . And this has today been precisely determined in the Bull of Benedict. XIV. which begins, Sacramentum, (see at the end of the book Decret. I. ubi praecipitur fieri denunciatio, etiamsi sollicitatio mutua fuerit; ibi enim praecipitur denunciandus esse Confessorem sollicitans, etiamsi Sacerdos sit, qui jurisdictione ad absolutionem valide impendiendam careat, aut sollicitatio inter Confessarium et poenitentem mutua fuerit sive sollicitanti poenitens consenserit sive consensus minime præstaverit vel longum tempus post ipsam sollicitationem jam effluerit.

Seek. X. ubi præcipitur denunciandus esse Confessorius sollicitans, etiamsi Sacerdos sit, qui jurisdictione ad absolutionem valide impertiendam careat, aut sollicitatio inter Confessarium, et poenitentem mutua fuerit sive sollicitanti poenitens consenserit, sive consensum minime præstiterit, vel longum tempus post ipsam sollicitationem jam effluxerit. Whether a layman should be denounced, or not — one who does not assist at confession, pretending to be the confessor? It is answered affirmatively according to Canon Law, Rule 3. Reason, because although he is not to be denounced on account of solicitation according to the Bull of Gregory XV, chapter 3, lib. 196.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. Nevertheless, the Sacrament of Penance should be announced from another Constitution of Gregory XIII, in which it is stated that whoever is not a Priest and hearing Sacramental Confessions is commanded to announce [this fact]. Whether, however, one turns to solicit such a non-sacerdotal person for denunciation so that he hears Confession not only after having heard Confession, but also presumptuously as if demanding absolution.

From the words of the aforementioned Bull it appears sufficient that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years being, as it were, odious and strict to be understood in the case of ordinary, not extraordinary elections; namely, that when there, it is said if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years being, as it were, odious and strict to be understood in the case of ordinary, not extraordinary elections. Inquisitores Sancti Officii debeant procedere non ad Sacerdotes qui Missas celebrant aut sacramentaliter Confessiones audiunt. But Mazz. p. 437 n. 685, with Acunna and Sancio say: absolutely necessary that they absolve presumptuously; for it is said in the edict of the Holy Inquisition generally that he ought to be denounced who, being not a priest, administers the Sacrament; but the Sacrament of Penance is not reckoned as administered by him who does not impart absolution. But notwithstanding this, from the aforementioned edict: if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. A heretic must be denounced here even if he does not absolve, since it is said there that one should be denounced as suspected of heresy: Even though those who, not being ordained priests, dare to celebrate Mass, nor having pronounced the words of consecration, or presuming to minister the Sacrament of Penance to Christ's faithful, do not reach the height of absolution (this being noted).

Likewise it is certain from the Bull of Benedict (as we shall see shortly above in the preceding Question) that a priest should be denounced as solicitous in confession, even if he lack jurisdiction. Confesses solicits the priest? Some few affirm among the common; and generally it is more true to deny it. R. 23. l. c. cum . Sousa; Acun-na; Sancio, et Leand. Reason, because penal laws are not to be extended case by case.

Neither does the same reasoning apply here for the penitent as it does for the confessional, which is discussed in Chapter III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. By license 149, on account of various considerations which are apparent to each one; and precisely on account of suspicion of the seal of revelation, if the confessor should denounce a penitent. Question. Twelfth. Whether the priest should be denounced as a presbyter who solicits the penitent?

The first opinion affirms this, and Freita, Trimarchius, and Corro hold it according to Ratio, because the interpreter does not merely bear parts of the penitent's confession, but also presumptuous matters of the Confessor; hence, he equally inflicts injury upon the Sacrament along with the Confessor. The second however, common opinion denies it, and this view is held by Power no. 48g. Diana R. g. Sousa et Sancio; et quia interprete magis se habet ex parte poenitentis, quam Confessarii. Reason 2 and is more weighty, because according to the Bull only the Confessors solicit the denunciation of, as we have said, penal laws do not extend beyond express cases.

Nevertheless, they say: Potest. l.c. et Diana p.g. tract. g. Ratio third and more persuasive, because from the Bull only confessors soliciting denunciations are to be reported, as we have said, and laws penal do not extend beyond expressly stated cases. Note, cum Leand. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., licet ex Bulla interpres sollicitans non sit denun- ciandus, tamen denunciari debeat ex edicto S. Inquisitionis supra citato n. 68o. in fine, ubi denunciandi sunt omnes de hæresi suspecti, et inter hujusmodi suspectos enumerantur omnes illi, che abustio il Sacramento della Penitenza, servendosi della Confessio- ne, o Confessionarius a fint disonesti, sollicitando in essi i penitenti ad turpia, ed avendo con essi discorsi di cose illicite, et non convenienti ul fine per lo quale è stato istituito. Wherefore it is fitting that the interpreter be denounced who already, for the sake of profit from the penitent's confession, solicits or converses with him about illicit matters. Question NoneXIII.

Whether the Confessor is to be denounced who solicits the penitent, so as to induce some woman to commit sin with him? Now they, and p. 5 n. 2 (the precise Bull) consider it not probable that it should be denounced from the Decretals. Pius IV. and Clement. VIII. 19§ Lib. VI.

Treatise. Chapter IV. On the Sacrament of Penance. But, even justly speaking, the aforementioned Bull. Moreover, should a Confessor be denounced who encourages the penitent to consent to commit a sin not with himself but with another?

But now some, once considering it probable, thoroughly rejected it; therefore, I ought not to denounce him, but today it is certain that the

opposite is true, with Blessed [or "with Blessing"] Benedict. XIV. in Bulla Sacramentum (cited n. 687. What. IX.) § 2. has defined that this Confessor must absolutely be denounced, even if the solicitation was not performed for himself, but for another person. 692 Question NoneXIV.

Whether the confessors' solicitors are to be denounced after they have already passed from life? Asserting this, he denies it more probably; but that same one notes in § III: Should they be bound to denounce? Whether a woman can be absolved after being solicited, before she denounces? 693 And whether, after a denunciation has been made, any Confessor can absolve from an excommunication contracted on account of negligence in denunciation? Whether the Confessor is always bound to warn about the obligation to denounce? Qu. I. May those who cannot prove the denounced matter be obliged to denounce?

And who else know about the solicitation? 696 Qu. II. Whether there is an obligation to denounce if a crime is concealed? 697 Qu. III. Whether there is an obligation to denounce if a crime has been hidden for a long time? 698 Qu.

IV. Is one bound to denounce who knows that a solicitation has been made in secret? Is it bound to be denounced who knows solicitation under secrecy? III. Appendix concerning confessors importunate in solicitation. 199 Qu.

V. Whether there is an obligation to denounce by means of a letter or through delegates? And whether at some time a confessor is bound to receive or defer a denunciation? Qu. VI. Is a confessor bound to denounce a woman who consents to solicitation? 701 Qu.

VII. Is there an obligation to denounce one who consents to solicitation, if it is hoped that the solicitor might be amended through correction? It must be noted I. that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary one. Thus, a penitent cannot be absolved unless he first denounces: and if there is an impediment to immediately making the denunciation, at least they should be prepared without delay to denounce; otherwise, they gravely sin and incur excommunication. Thus and similarly to others generally. Therefore most improbably did Pontas speak that verse.

Confessor. 2. Case 17: The confessor reluctantly denounces the penitent who solicits an unwarranted absolution. But also he who is penitent may be absolved before denunciation, if there be a just cause for delaying it; except when the Minister of the Tribunal is far removed; or when there is necessity of communicating to avoid scandal, or on account of the Jubilee, and someone can be chosen as Confessor supplementary, then he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, like the prohibition concerning the ordinary election, odious and strictly to be observed, not concerning an extraordinary election. Thus Chapter 2, Title 13, Decree 7, Section 5, Article number 38, and also Rule 5, Number 29. In Bulla autem Bened.

XIV. The sacrament is thus regarded around this: The confessors are earnestly admonished to beware lest, with respect to penitents whom they already know to have been solicited by another, they impart sacramental absolution unless, previously, the guilty party has indicated a denunciation effective in bringing about an indictment before a competent judge, or at least, promise and declare themselves, as soon as possible, to do so. Nam etiam, facto denunciationi, paenitens possit absolveri a quocumque confessario a excommunicatione quam incurrit? They deny. c. 4 n. 70. Diana dicitur R. 29 cum Sancio, et affirmat vero Lupus p. 1, 5 ar. 3 p. 96 (cui adhaeret V) quia, ut ait, re-200 Lib.

VI. Tract. Fourth. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, this censure is preserved only during contumacy; hence, it expires upon denunciation or the death of the one denounced; as Lupus infers from the words of the edict, which are usually: From the delta of the anathema no release shall be made unless by us, or by the supreme Tribunal of the Holy Office. And indeed, considering the aforesaid words, the opinion of Lupus seems sufficiently probable.

But against this note must be taken if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood to apply more strictly to ordinary than to extraordinary choice. If some one were unjustly accused or advised to accuse some innocent Priest of solicitation: he would incur a reserved case of the Pope, but without censure; as is contained in the Bull of Benedict. XIV. The sacrament was given on the day prior to the feast of June 1741 and has been fully recounted. I. in Dissertation. Prefatory remarks at the beginning of the page.

XXVI. ubi sic dicitur: Quaecumque persona, quae execrabili hujusmodi flagitio se inquinaverit, vel per seipsam innocentes confessarios impie calumniando, vel sceleste procurando, ut id ab aliis fiat..... Impiiis suasionibus aut promissis, aut blanditia, aut minis, aut alio quovis modo etc. Adver- tunt tamen n. 232 in fin., intelligi nisi suasio ante executio denunciationis efficaciter revocetur. This nonetheless proceeded according to a particular edict of the Inquisition of some Kingdom, but in the edict issued by the Sacred General Inquisition on the 3rd day it is absolutely stated that heretics or those suspected of heresy should be denounced within twelve days, under excommunication reserved to the Pope and the Holy See. This edict was not perpetual, but only for this particular act, as there had been a statement: "We command that within the next twelve days, to be computed, etc." Hence, the aforementioned authors show sufficiently that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it could well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strict, should be understood in relation to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If someone refuses to be bound by this knowledge, the Holy Inquisition will not obligate conscious sinners. Cap. III. Appendix concerning confessors soliciting. 201. For those who would in the future; for otherwise it would have said not proximately, but from the day of knowledge. True Diana p. 4 tr. 5. R. 41 with Peyrin holds that the edict was intended to be perpetual, and this "proximè" should rather be understood from the day of knowledge of the offense.

But it must be noted that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, that the same Holy Inquisition afterwards on March 10th of the year 1677 issued another edict (if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, that the same Holy Inquisition afterwards on March 10th of the year 1677 issued another edict). Potest thus says: We command under the penalty of anathema with a general sentence, that within one month those should reveal themselves to the Holy Office or to all Ordinaries who know or have known or will know about anyone being Heretics or suspected of Heresy. Given this, it seems sufficiently probable to me and to other learned men consulted by me, that either the first edict was not perpetual, or that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after

the term of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is so odious and strict that it must be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary one; moreover, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium, being so odious and strict, must be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary one. Furthermore, it is more likely that the Holy Inquisition has, in this second edict, moderated the obligation of denouncing within twelve days by extending it to a month; thus the first edict's presumption was mitigated by removing the reservation from excommunication. This nevertheless must always be understood: if the denunciation has already been fulfilled. Beforehand. II. When in practice 5. if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, must be understood to apply to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Even if the Confessor prudently suspects that the denunciation will certainly not occur, he still ought to admonish her regarding his obligation, and to release her if she refuses to denounce, Reason being, because it is expressly commanded by the Pontiff in the Bull that the Confessor must admonish; and even though generally speaking, when the Confessor prudently suspects that an admonition will not be profitable, he ought to omit it: yet this does not apply here when the aim is to avoid a common harm, as is the case in the present instance, according to the aforementioned n. 615.

But it is asked I. Whether a Confessor is bound to denounce one who solicits [someone], who cannot justly be held accountable for such solicitation? They deny it, Turris and question 2, seventy-six. Bord. to. 1 c. 30 n. 100.: 10 etc. Et oppositum videtur expressè condemnatum ex Prop. 5 proscripta ab . 202 Lib. VI: Treatise.

IV. On the Sacrament of Penance, he said: Although it is evident to you that Peter is a heretic, you are not bound to denounce him if you cannot prove it. Namque autem debet ad denunciandum teneri nec solum qui est sollicitatus, sed etiam qui ex alio certo scit sollicitationem? They rightly affirm when . And this, even if he be an infant, provided he be of sound mind and aware of the crime through persons of reputable faith; otherwise, if aware through those of unsound faith or light-minded women. As Cardinal . Hoc however is to be said not now from Bull 680 at the end, 66 Question None

II. Is there an obligation to denounce soliciters, even if the crime is

hidden? They deny Fag. Megal. and others according to c. 4 n. 8o because in the Bull there is mention made of the abuse, they say that by word they abuse it if someone be chosen Confessor as supplement, well can this be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood odiously and strictly insofar as it regards the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one; for such prohibition signifies frequency and publicity of acts. Totidemque retendum est oppositum cum ex D., quia licet in poenalibus verba legis stricte interpretanda sint, attamen si ex interpretatione stricta lex inutilis redderetur, ut in nostro casu evenerit, tunc verba non stricte sed late sunt accipienda. 67 Quærit.

III. an tenendum sit sollicitatus ad denunciandam sollicitationem habitam a longo tempore? Hence said; unless hindered by contrary diocesan edicts. But today it has been declared from the cited Decree of Benedictus XIV. I. Sacramentum (see at the end of the book) is to be made, even if a long time has elapsed since the solicitation. 68 Inquiry. IV.

Whether one is bound to make known the solicitation, if he knows that it took place secretly naturally? Chapter III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. 205 Fagun et Fragosa negant apud Sed contra dictum rectè tenent Diana R. 32. Cum enim propalatio secreti esset tunc contra humanum commercium, et praesumptum contra publicum bonum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Certe in consiliis expetendis intervenit. He asks. Y.

Is a woman bound to make known [denunciare] 699 by letter, or through a intermediary person, if she is unable to do so herself? Si non possit personaliter adire Episcopum ob ægritudinem, clausuram, aliudve impedimentum physicum vel morale, non tenitur quidem per seipsam ad denunciandum. See p. 442 q. 2. A doubt arises whether this is to be denounced by letter or through messengers? It seems to be denied from the propositions issued n. 563.

Dub. 3 ubi diximus, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. habens peccatum reservatum non teneatur petere licentiam à Superiore per litteras, vel mediam personam, si non possit illum adire. But in our case it is more true to affirm with n. 8. Mazzot. l. c. 5. Rule 2. Disparity indeed

exists between the petition for absolution from those reserved [cases], and the denunciation of solicitation; for there the obligation is to remain before the Superior, so that the penitent might receive from him in conjunction with absolution due counsel and penance; whence he who cannot go himself is not bound through another: but the obligation to denounce the solicitor is rather not to personally attend the Superior, but to report or indicate to him the sinner (as Benedict puts it).

XIV. In sua Bullia), quæ delatio, si ab aliquo nequit fieri per se, saltem est facienda (modò absit periculum propriae infamiae) per epistolam vel alias personam vel monendo judicem ut mittat notarium in domum suam: qui enim tenetur ad finem, tenetur praesumptum ad media. 204 Lib. VI. Treatise. IV. On the Sacrament of Penance.

They observe here, c. 6 in practice, that it is not expedient if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, that another three years can beneficially confirm him after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, he can beneficially be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The penitent himself takes upon himself this burden of delivering the denunciation in place of the penitent, or receiving it, because thereby he exposes himself to the reproach and dangers of many. And much less is one bound to this, wherefore it does not seem probable to me that if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he might well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strictly to be accepted in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, is written by P. 2 where it says, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he might well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strictly to be accepted in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, if the penitent could not make a denunciation through another person, then the Confessor must supply for the role of the penitent in making such a denunciation, because, as he says, it concerns a matter of faith. But this reason, so briefly presented, does not convince. He adds: if a Confessarius is elected for supplementation, he can be confirmed well through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessary beyond three years is so odious and strict in ordinary election but not extraordinary. For this reason it will be drawn

forth from some letter of S. C., assented to by Urban.

VIII. an. 1624 apud . From this Epistle, however, no general confirmation is derived; for first, this Decree was particular with regard to that case; moreover, it cannot be deduced from there that such an obligation has generally been imposed on confessors. Hence we are not bound in the interim, should it be determined regarding this precept that one ought to depart from the common opinion of the Doctors, and from the universal sense and usage of all confessors who do not acknowledge this most onerous obligation. Furthermore, we do not deny that, if a Confessor be elected for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received with regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. In some case (for instance, if somewhere public damage occurs and no other way presents itself for its avoidance), a Confessor might lawfully be bound by charity to undertake such an obligation; but this happens rarely. They say, however, Delbene in 9 and the Author that positive precepts do not oblige to an excessively difficult matter.

Moreover, as previously stated above, if a Confessor be elected for supplementary purposes, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed, pertains rather to ordinary election than extraordinary. But if neither at the place itself can the penitent be induced by the Confessor to denounce, then recourse should be had to Cap. III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. 205 ratur ad S. Sedem pro opportuno remedio, et interim non absolvatur. Mazzotta however wrote at some point to the Holy See in a case of great shame and panic-timor, giving permission for the Confessor to absolve on that occasion without burdening the penitent with denunciation. Inquire. VI.

Whether a woman is bound to denounce a confessor solicitous toward her, with whom she herself consents? They denied it three times with Diana; according to the Rule of Law in chapter What sometimes concerning penance. D. 1 ubi dicitur (Non dico, ut te prodas.) Nequit autem quis manifestare complicem, quin seipsum tradat; et ideo addunt: non esse obligationem denunciandi socium haereticum. However rightly they say that this woman was held for denunciation by Peyrin and many others; today this has been definitively established by the Supreme Authorities. Bened.

XIV. in cit. Bulla, Sacramentum, ubi præcipitur fieri denunciatio,

praesumptum—si poenitens consenserit. The reason is that in this case a woman, without danger to her reputation, can declare the solicitous person who has presumptively asked her, so that she herself, when questioned presumptuously, may be able to deny her own consent and whatever might have followed from it, as stated in the Decree. S. 1723 quem dictum habet: Si mulier consentit Confessario sollicitanti, non tenetur suum consensum manifestare; nec potest super hoc ab Episcopo interrogari. Inquire.

VII. Is the penitent bound to denounce the reciter of the solli citantem, if through correction his hope for moral amendment is his reason? The first opinion denies this, and thus S. Th. 2. 2 q. 33 art. 7 taught: If a heretic privately withdraws men from faith... it should immediately proceed to denunciation... unless perhaps someone firmly judged that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is held for ordinary election, not for supplementary one. It should immediately through secret admonition be able to hinder such kind of malice. They followed him: Soto, Canus, Lugo, c. 4 n. 96. And particularly with regard to the crime of solicitation, this judgment has been earnestly maintained: But those who followed thereafter were Verùm secun- 206 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Fourth. On the Sacrament of Penance. The statement affirms this, and Mazz. holds this on page 440, note 90, with . Diana, Leand., and others besides.

And this must undoubtedly be held today after the Decretum of Alexander VII edited on July 8, 1660 (extended to the faithful) for the purpose of denouncing those whom they know to be at least lightly suspected of being of some faith, as confessors solicitously inquire that it commonly teaches 28 and Acunna, Menoch. etc. Therefore saying the Pontifex, even if he supposes, a denunciation should always be made. ## § IV. ## Of doubtful solicitations. 702 Qu. I. Whether the Confessor is to be denounced if he has indeed solicited in doubt, or whether he has truly solicited? What, if vehement proofs come regarding solicitation? 703 Qu. II.

Whether the Confessor should be denounced for praising a woman for her beauty? Or who gives her a great gift? 704 Examine various particular cases of solicitation. 705 Concerning the bread of those who solicit, and notably concerning the disability of the bread to be celebrated, does this incur before the sentence? And whether those ignorant of it are excused from it? And can Bishops dispense from this? 702 QUESTION IS RAISED. I.

Whether the Confessor should be denounced in a case of doubt, or whether he has solicited [the confession]? It must be distinguished: if it has been true solicitation that was made or spoken, and doubt solely concerns whether that Confessor or another Confessor did that or spoke it, then they are speaking correctly because otherwise that Priest might remain in some way slandered, and the reputation of the neighbor who possesses that should not be injured in a doubtful matter. Chapter III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus. 269 Si vero persona Confessarii sit certa, et dubitatur, an ejus factum vel dictum fuerit vera sollicitatio, tunc cum communiori et veriori sententia dicendum, non esse obligationem denunciandi. Thus 5.

Bordon according to the Author. (287 with Bossuet and according to) Reason, because doubtful matters are to be received in the better part, and ambiguous words are to be interpreted benignly, as say Bonac. and Menoch. and Juris 49 in 6 where: In favor of bread a more benign interpretation is to be made. Therefore, in a doubt no one is deprived of fame which he possesses; and therefore the Bull commands that those who are solicitous be announced, but it does not allow to say that they have truly been solicitous concerning what is doubtful whether they have genuinely been solicitous or not; for a doubtful origin is not a crime, as 1 c. 10 n. 74 and Suarez in 3. p. t. 5 d. 40 sect. 6 n. 5 teach. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, from the Decree of Alexander. VIII. sint denunciandi praesumptum leviter suspectæ de haresi; nam ad leviter non jam referri placeat suspicionem, sed ad haresim, de qua potest quis vel leviter vel vehementer esse suspectus. However, it must be received 1 with cc. from Pegna, according to the author of the instruction etc., 1. c. according to Bossio, if: there are indications of vehemence in solicitation; for although these are not altogether evident, yet, since they come from only one side, they suffice to found a moral certitude concerning solicitation.

It is to be received 2 that if the words themselves denote solicitation and there is merely a doubt whether the Confessor has applied them for an evil end; then the presumption is derived from common accidents; except when a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, in which case he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. That is why, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement,

he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The presumption itself of this end is to be received according to the property of the words: hence in cap. Perniciosum causa 18 q. 2 d., it is said that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The presumption itself of this end is to be received according to the property of the words: hence in cap. Perniciosum causa 18 q. 2 d., it is said that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The presumption itself of this end is to be received according to the property of the words: hence in cap. Perniciosum causa 18 q. 2 d., it is said that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The presumption itself of this end is to be received according to the property of the words: hence in cap. Perniciosum causa 18 q. 2 d., it is said that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond Question None.: II. Whether a Confessor is to be denounced, who [is] mentioned in libellum 203, nummer 508. VI. Treatise.

IV. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, does it commend the woman for her beauty? Potest affirms, n. 554, and Sanctarel, in 9 R. 32, that such praise should not be given without any occasion, because you regularly praise women's beauty so that others may sin through their beauty. They indeed deny Freita, n. 639, because he who praises a woman for her beauty with decent words is not said to have unhonest dealings with her. But it is better to distinguish this disposition if he praises her from a certain imprudence, or through lightness of mind.

He asserts however that in this case it is certain but presumptuous to say that perpendend circumstances must be considered, even though I believe that in this there ought rather to be an indication of a corrupt mind enticing the lady to a depraved affection. And the same thing they say the DDs. If the Confessor gives a valuable or unusual penitential gift, as stated

by R. 34 with Escob., authors cited rightly imply its malice should be suspected from adjuncts, namely from the condition of the penitent, from the quantity and quality of the gift, and from the manner in which it is given, etc. Otherwise, according to what was said in the preceding question, when words or deeds are ambiguous, the Confessor is not to be denounced unless there is a certain knowledge of his morally wicked intention. Hence, various particular cases are drawn forth, in which more common Doctors consider the Confessor to be rightly denouncable. 1. If the Confessor say to the penitent: "With you I would have sinned, if I had been secular," Bordonus denies it, because these words do not imply a mortal sin, but only Cap. III. Appendix concerning confessors importunate in solicitation. Indicating a pusillanimous affection.

They more probabily affirm, Potest, n. 558 et Diana fo. c., because such words seem especially provocative to venery: and since they are irrelevant to confession, justly should one be cautious about enticement. If he say to a woman: Remember me, for I love thee from my heart; thus Diana at Potest, d. n. 558 cum Roncag. in Reg. praxis. At Bordonus excusat; hoc melius puto explorandum ex circumparsionibus. 3. If one says: Expect me today at your home, because I will have to speak with you; and afterwards treat matters of impropriety at home, for that solicitation being made in the home is said morally to be made in Confession; thus it is rightly stated 4. If he says: These thy sins have caused me to fall into involuntary pollution; even more if he says voluntary; thus it is possible when.

If he says: I do not wish to hear you in confession, lest anything befall me, because I have been overcome by your love; thus (suppose this is said to a woman seeking confession), because these words seem provocative and unchaste, and are offered occasion by confession; and thus the presumptuous one understands. The same person thinks: I feel the whole of me moved by the affection with which I pursue you. 6. If the Confessor should say to a woman who asserts that he repulsed an obscene temptation: But if someone were to give him money, would he have sinned? He affirms it; or if he invokes an oath, and afterwards at home, having received money, he solicits her. And he consents 7.

If he says: Why did you presume to come with me without human authority? or if he says this? I shall come home, and much tell you, made. If a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious, strict, and to be accepted as the election of ordinary, not extraordinary. Thus, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against

choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be accepted is of the election of ordinary, not extraordinary. I have said. Or to a confessing woman who admits an infamous desire, he says: About this we will speak after the confession. But in these cases the circumstances are to be taken into consideration, for sometimes they do not amount to solicitations. If he blaspheme his concubine, if a confessor be chosen as an addition [to those already appointed], it may well be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the addition, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is so odious and strict that it must be understood concerning ordinary choice, not extraordinary, with other conditions. 21st Lib: VI: Tract.

IV. Of Saramanto Penitence. If it has displeased him, let him judiciously investigate whether, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in regard to an ordinary choice, not an extraordinary one. For, what pertains to that which, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in regard to an ordinary choice, not an extraordinary one, let it proceed from zeal; otherwise, presumptuously, if it exceeds in reprimanding, adding menaces, injuries, and similar acts; or he objure only the sins committed with others, and not those which he has brought upon himself, because then he shows his lascivious love. Ità Potest. num. 562. At the end thereof it must be noted, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can certainly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in ordinary election, not in extraordinary ones. For then objurgation proceeds from zeal; if excessive, it adds threats, injuries, and such like; or objurgates only the sins committed with others, and not those he commits with himself, for then he shows his lascivious love. XIV. quae incipit, In Generali Congregatione, (vide Decr.

III. in calce libri) sancitum habetur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

Confessarii solicitantes, in actu sacramentalis Confessionis, sive illus occasione, aut praetextu, praeter penas à jure inflatas, perpetuam praesumptum inhabilitationem incurrant ad Sacrificii celebrationem. The same penalty was incurred by priests abusing the sacrifice of Mass for sorcery according to the same Decree. However, many doubts arose here. It is doubted whether the aforementioned incapacitation accrues before at least a declaratory sentence is issued?

In the previous edition of this Work, I affirmed that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be adequately confirmed by another three years after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period should, like the prohibition on ordinary election, be interpreted strictly and odiously; not as an extraordinary election. This is consistent with the doctrine commonly taught by the Doctors, that penalties privatively preventing acquisition of some right or cessation from enjoying a previously acquired right generally incur before sentence according to what is stated in book 1, note 149. However, some pious Religious, having read this in my Work, wrote to me from Rome that if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can conveniently be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond the triennium, as odious and strict, is understood concerning ordinary election, not supplementary; and this, because the deprivation which involves incapacity to acquire some right, or cessation from using some already acquired right, commonly do doctors teach that they ought to be incurred ordinarily before sentence, according to what has been said in book 1, n. 149. Attamen quidam probus Religiosus, cum haec legisset in meo Opere, scripsit mihi Romæ: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi; quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa et stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. poenæ privativae, quæ important inhabilitationem ad aliquod jus acquirendum vel cessationem à quoddam jus jam acquisitum utendo, communiter docent DD., ordinariè ante sententiam incurrantur juxta dicta libri I n. 149.

Two Theologians of the Sacred Congregation of the Roman Inquisition were of opposite opinion concerning this, and hence it was not required to incur the aforementioned penalty. At first the beginning reason for this opinion did not occur to me; but afterward, having more carefully considered the matter, in this same work of mine number 248 I observed that if a Confessor be elected for supplementarily, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it

is odious and strict, ought to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary.,for which reason, if a Confessor be elected for supplementarily, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Suarez, Bonacín.; x num. 148) say declaratorily that a presumptively required sentence is needed regarding privative penalties or incapacities, namely in the case where the accused cannot suffer the penalty without his own infamy, as would commonly occur in our case if the priest solicitously should be disabled for a long time Cap. III. Appendix de Confessariis sollicitantibus nihil prohibet abstinere a celebrando. I say for a long time; for if he could obtain a dispensation for a brief period concerning the aforementioned inability, and meanwhile suspend the celebration without his own infamy, he is bound to abstain from it.

It is doubted whether ignorance invincible excuses from this disability? In hoc dubio mihi videtur posse id probabiliter affirmari, juxta ea, quae dicentur infra de irregularitate ex delicto 1.7 n. 35, i.e., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; ad incidendum irregularitatem ex delicto requiratur scientia irregularitatis, quae incurritur, quia licet irregularitas non sit censura qua excusat equidem ignorantia invincibilis, sed impedimentum, tamen talis irregularitas ex delicto est vere piena aut saltem habet rationem peinae ad quam incidere cum sit peina extraordinaria et exorbitans ita ut secundum rei naturam non possit privari illius scientia requiritur; et idem posse dici videtur in nostro caso de inhabilitate celebrandi quae est procul dubio imposita in poenam sollicitationis. It is doubted whether the Bishop can dispense in this state of disability? See what is said in 1. 7 n. 353 where it will be stated that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Bishops from Tractatus V.

ON THE LAST ANOINTING AND ORDINATION. ## HEAD I. What is the Extreme Unction, and what should be observed concerning it? 906 What is

this Sacrament E, and whether instituted by Christ? 707 Q. I. By which any partial anointing confers grace? II.

Is conferred grace when the obiate retires? On the remote matter of this sacrament, 708. Does the precept for annually renewing Oil obligate under grave penalty? And whether blessed oil can be added to unblessed oil? Book 212, Article 12. VI. Treatise.

V. Concerning Extreme Unction and Order. 709 The oil should be from olives, and anointed with God's blessing. 1. Is a blessing required by necessity for the Sacrament? Dub. 2. Whether a blessing is to be specifically required in respect to Extreme Unction?

Dub. 3. Can this blessing be imparted by the Pope simply to a Priest? Dub. 4. Does one drop of oil suffice for anointing? Is an anointing of the five senses necessary for the Sacrament?

Is it necessary a double unction of the eyes, etc.? And is it necessary unction of the neck and feet? Is the order of unctions necessary? And to what does it direct itself with respect to the essence of this Sacrament? Form 711. Dub. 1. Does the form absolutely have to be deprecative?

Dub. 2. Whether the words are essentially permissive: By His most holy mercy? Dub. 3. Is it valid to use the form by saying, "Anoint thee," etc.? To whom is the Last Unction to be administered? Dub. 1. Is a valid imposition made on a sound person?

Dub. 2. To any one laboring under whatever bodily infirmity? Dub. 3. To a woman laboring in birth? 714 Dub. 4. Is it licit to minister in supposed sole danger?

Adv. 1. Not is it to be expected the extreme part of life. Ad- vert. 2. Not lawfully to be ministered unless a near danger of death exists. What in the doubt, whether the peril of death is present? 715 Dub. 5.

May this Sacrament be repeated in the same infirmity? What disposition is required in the recipient? And whether Extreme Unction should be given after Viaticum? Whether it should be ministered to children? 718 Dub. 1. To infants? 719 Doubt 2. Whether it should be given to children whose use of reason is doubted? 720 Dub. 3. Can a child capable of sinning be given to communion, but not yet suitable for it? 721 Dub. 4.

Can an adult who is incapacitated be given baptism immediately after

Baptism? 722 De ministro hujus Sacramenti. Can any priest give that ex hypothesi with the presumed consent of the parish priest? What is the validity concerning Regulars? If the Pastor abstains or does not wish to give it? And what if he is Excommunicated or suspended? 724 May this Sacrament be given without a minister? And whether one can anoint one part for another person?

Can only the Priest minister that? What if there is a deficiency in the transmission between unctions? 735 Is it. Is the priest to incur irregularity if he dies while turning him, etc. ? Chapter on the Administration of this Sacrament. May it be permitted to minister sometimes without sacred vestments? What sin is it to omit prayers, or other kinds of supplications?

What is the sin of deferring oil without light? And what is the nature of omitting the sign of the Cross? And is it licit for a Priest to carry oil and walk with Platico? 729. Is a Pastor bound to give this Sacrament to petitioners? And is it permissible when there is danger to life? Are other priests bound to give it?

Is it licit for a parish priest to retain oil at home? 731. Of the effects of this Sacrament. By means of Extreme Unction, are mortal sins per se remitted? And whether the principal effect thereof is the remission of sins, or the remission of the remnants of sin? 732. Of the subject of this Sacrament.

Are madmen capable thereof? Are drunken persons? Are they penitent, excommunicated, and injured in a fight? That which is troubled by madness? Are they mute, deaf, and blind from birth? 733.

Is it a grave sin to neglect receiving this Sacrament? Resp. 1 is a Sacrament instituted by Christ for this purpose; therefore, it is perilous to one's life to confer salvation upon the soul, or to presume at the healing of the body through the anointing of oil and the prayer of the Priest. St. Thomas in the Fourth Book, Question Twenty-Three, Article First. "It is defined that this is a true sacrament from Chapter 1 of De E." U. It was instituted by Christ after the Resurrection, as held in his treatise VII c. 1 n. 3, and promulgated by St. James c. 5 v. 14 et 15, where it is said: If any one be found weak among you, let him be brought to the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil...and the prayer of faith shall save the sick person, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has sinned in his sins, they shall be forgiven to him.

It is certain likewise that this Sacrament is one; although there be many unctions, nevertheless all pertain to one interior medicine. Questio autem

prima. By means of whichever unction specifically grace is conferred? They affirm. Unus novem tres.

Sporer n. 68; him Scotto, Roncio, and Mast. ac Croix a14 Lib. VI. Traot. V. From the Treatise on the Last Anointing and Order, 1:6, p. 2, n. 2105. And with Soto.

Marsh. But he denies with the more common view of St. Thomas. Suppl. qu. 30 art. 1 ad 3 ubi: Et ideo in ultima unctione gratia infunditur. And Wigandt follows this in his translation 14 n. 109, and with many who say that no anointing per se constitutes a Sacrament nor a presumptuous partial one, hence nothing is conferred of habitual grace whenever the form of the last anointing is completed, which completes the Sacrament; but at the end of the ultimate anointing both remission of sins and penalties is granted simultaneously; whereas special aids annexed to grace are not conferred unless at an opportune time. Both these opinions are probable.

Question NoneTwo. Whether this sacrament can be given validly and effectually, so that, upon removal of the impediment, grace may be conferred? They commonly affirm. Henry etc., with and the Cross I. 6 p. 1 n. 202.

See the aforementioned statements regarding v. Not. 2. From this conclusion follow the Psalmists and others, that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict in the case of an ordinary election, but not extraordinary, suffices; provided that, if someone receives the Sacrament in mortal sin with sound mind or senses, it will be sufficient if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict in the case of an ordinary election, but not extraordinary, suffices; furthermore, provided that he afterwards have attrition, for receiving grace. But this runs thus: if the obstacle is removed, and the same disease and danger remain; at least so far as the effect of special aids, as they say > 1. The material is removed from it the holy oil, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo

Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. in the chrismatory a letter I is signed (in cuius defectu non licet uti chrismate: si tamen usus sis, nihil repetendum esse, docet . 5 tr. 8 c. 2 n. 3), idque renovandum est quotannis in Coena Domini, veteri exusto; * (Et hoc ex precepto Clem.

VIII. ap. c. 2 n. 15 et ex Rit. Rom. ubi dicitur: Oleum infirmorum... singulis annis... in Cœna Domini... veteri combusto, renovandum est. An autem hoc praeceptum obliget sub gravi? Esc. 1. 22 n. 81 denies it with Sa., etc., because the gravity of this precept is not certain except for the chrism alone; as is found in c. Si quis, de Conscr. of 4. But they more probably affirm. Cit.

Croix l. 6 p. 1 n. 42 cum Dic. item et Zambr. ap Ratio, quia videatur materia satis gravis, et talis est universalis Ecclesiæ consuetudo), si tamen novum haberi non possit, licet uti antiquo, . c. * Et ità. 2 n. 11 cum . S. C. ap. And if this be not sufficient, something secreted otherwise, or un consecrated even in necessity (though in lesser quantity than the old one) to be added. *Ita ex Rituali Romano, ubi dicitur: Id tamen (idest oleum) si forte infrà annum...ita deficiat, ut sufficiere non possit videatur, neque aliud benedictum haberi queat; modico oleo non benedicto, in minori quantitate superinfuso; reparari potest.* Etsi et aliis dicitur contrarium habere praxim Ecclesiæ; ut scilicet paulatim, et per vices. If necessity requires it on account of a great abundance, even a much greater quantity shall be added than was consecrated by the Bishop at the beginning.

Bonaventura, de septimo, quaestio prima, numero octavo, ex sancta congregatione apostolica. Cardenas, utque colligitur ex c. Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. in dubiis, de Conscr. Church according to what has been said this book 6 number 368. Thus » let part of the oil, which is now poured out, be less by one-half part than that to which it is poured. Nevertheless, this is correctly said in R. 1 nov., "It must be permitted except in a case of necessity." It is certain that according to this rule the oil for the sick should be olive oil, because from common use the name oil properly refers to olive oil; thus commonly the doctors and canonists with chapter 2 n. 1 and Unít. qu. 2, and it can be seen in the Decree of Florence by Sporer Suppl. page 220 n. 61 where for this Sacrament’s matter olive oil blessed by the Bishop is assigned.

It is certain among all, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of

supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict and to be accepted from ordinary election, not from extraordinary, this oil should be blessed out of necessity from the precept, but there is doubt. An oleum infirmorum debeo esse benedictum ex necessitate Sacramenti? First sentence of Article 14 Book. VI. Traot.

V. On the Extreme Unction and Order. 1. 6 p. 2 n. 2105. with and Sot. Mire. But denies with St. Thomas in the more common place. Suppl. qu. 30 art. 1 ad 3 ubi: Et ideo in ultima unctione gratia infunditur.

And this is followed by Wigandt tr. 14 n. 109, and by many others who say that nounction per se nor any presumed partial sacrament can be constituted; thus nothing is conferred as habitual grace whenever the form of the ultimate unctio is completed, which constitutes the sacrament; yet in the end remission of sins and penances is conferred at the same time at the last unction; but special aids annexed to grace are not conferred except at an opportune time. Both these opinions are probable. Question NoneII. Whether this sacrament can be given in a valid and efficacious manner, so that, when the obstacle is removed, grace may be conferred?

They commonly affirm. Henry et al., with [annotation] from Croix I. 6 p. 1 n. 202. See what has been said regarding it. Note 2. Hence conclude the Psalmist ibid. with others: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years being odious and strict is held thus concerning ordinary election but not extraordinary. That is why, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarity, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years being odious and strict is held thus concerning ordinary election but not extraordinary; and which can have attrition to receive grace; otherwise, if out of malice.

This however runs thus: if the fever abates, but the same disease and danger persist; at least if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary, what that is, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The material is removed from the

blessed oil, » if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be taken regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, » that is, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be taken regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. (in the chrismatory vessel is signed the letter I (in the defect of which one may not use chrism: if however the use continues, nothing to repeat, teaches . 5 tr. 8 c. 2 n. 3.), that must be renewed annually at the Coenae Domini, old having been consumed; » (And this from the precept of Clem. VIII. ap. c. 2 n. 15 et ex Rit. Where it is said: Oil of the sick... singly each year... in the Lord's Supper... with the old oil consumed, let it be renewed; but whether this precept binds under a grave penalty? It denies Esc. 1. 22 n. 81 with Sa., etc., because concerning the gravity of this precept it is not certain, except for the case of chrism; as stated in c. Si quis, de Consecr.

Concerning four. But they more probably affirm. As cited. Croix 1. 6 p. 1 n. 42 cum Dic. item et Zambr. ap Ratio, quia detur materia satis gravis et talis est universalis Ecclesiae consuetudo *, si tamen novum haberi non possit, licet uti antiquo, . c. * Et ità . 2 n. 11 cum . S. C. ap. Gav.)* et, si hoc non sufficiat, alium consecratum vel in necessitate non consecratum (in minore tamen quantitate quam vetus est) addere.

* (Ita ex Rituale Romano, ubi dicitur: Id tamen (id est oleum) si forte infra annum...ita deficiat, ut sufficere non posse videatur, neque aliud benedictum haberi queat, modico oleo non benedicto, in minori quantitate superinfuso; reparari potest) * Etsi et aliis dicat contrarium habere praxim Ecclesiæ; ut scilicet paulatim, et per vices. (If necessity requires it on account of the abundance of sick people), a much greater quantity should be added than was consecrated by the Bishop at first. Bonaventura, decimus septimus, quaestio prima, nota octava ex sancta congregatione apostolica. Cardenas, utque colligitur ex c. Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. in dubiis, de Consecr. The Church according to what was said above, this 1st part, number 368.

Mode: partem olei, qua nunc effunditur, sit minor aliarum partium una, cui infunditur. Nevertheless, R. 1 spoke correctly when he said: »It should be permitted only in a case of necessity.» It is certain that this oil for the

sick which is prescribed must be olive oil, because from common usage the name of oil properly signifies this; thus commonly the Decretists with canon 2 n. 1 and Unct. qu. 2, and it appears from the Decree of Florence cited by Sporer Suppl. p. 220 n. 61 where olive oil is assigned as the matter for this Sacrament by the bishop blessed. It is certain among all, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be received regarding the ordinary election, and not the extraordinary one. This oil should be blessed from necessity of precept, but there is doubt about this. An oleum infirmorum debeo esse benedictum ex necessitate sacramenti? The first judgment Chapter 216.

VI. Treatise. V. Of the Last Unction and Birth, concerning two things among one where the pope says: For the Church intellect understands the matter (of the Last Unction) to be oil blessed by the bishop. Because (as they say), if oil is to be assigned here as matter, it is nevertheless not defined with respect to essence; if a Confessor is chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, the Episcopos blesses.

The second, however, most common opinion affirms, and this is held by St. Thomas. Suppl. qu. 29. art. 5. c. 2 n. 2 et Scot. ac alii apud Sporer 1. c. Ratio, quia Concilia in hoc dogmaticē locuta sunt, unde utrumque ad valorem hujus Sacramenti requirunt declararunt. Doubt is cast. Whether oil ought to be necessarily blessed with respect to the Extreme Unction? They deny it in section 39, article 1, note 9, and chapter 8, note 2. Because truly, oil is blessed by the Bishop; but they affirm it on page 2, note 5 by Palaus.

Holzrn. pag. 242 n. 7 item c. 2 n. 9; quia, congruent benedictione Chrismatis deputatur Chrisma pro Sacramento Confirmationis, ita benedictione olei infirmorum deputatur materia ad Sacramen- tum Extremae-Unctionis. Both opinions are probable; hence, the first cannot be applied in practice except in a case of necessity, wherein the oil of the sick is lacking; then Extreme Unction can be administered with the Chrism of Confirmation or oil of Catechumens under condition, as rightly stated: 1 n. 2... and Croix 1. 6. p. 2. n. 2000. And if later Oil of the Sick can be had, the Sacrament must be repeated, as they say, c.c., and as prescribed by S. Charles Borromaeus. Act. Doubt. 3.

Can such a blessing be committed by a simple priest? They deny it. Section

40, Article 1, and Bellarmine, Concordia, chapter 2, note 6. But it must be affirmed according to Holzmann, number 5, De Synodo 1, 7; c., 16, n. 4, ex Decretum. Clementis VIII. qui de Cap. I. On Extreme Unction, it was clarified that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction administered to Latins by Greek priests with oil blessed by those same priests is valid, as we have stated in Confirmat n. 163. There is doubt 4.

Does one suffice to minister this Sacrament with four oils? They deny Suarez, d. 40, sect. 2, n. 4, and Fillius. Registration 1, chapter 22, note 82. Because (as they say), proper anointing consists in diffusing oil over parts. But they commonly affirm with Dic. and Aversa that all parts ought to be anointed; for he truly anoints who pours oil, since oil is diffused more than other liquids.

This second opinion seems to me more probable; yet because the first is not unreasonable, at least extrinsically, it must be followed in practice. Regarding the value of the Sacrament, they properly say according to Dic. and Aversa that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, suffices for dipping the extremity of the finger in oil; and anointing. « 2. The proximate matter is the anointing of certain parts 716 of the body, and at least five senses; or if they be changed, of neighboring parts, made by the Priest, not simply by immediate contact of hand but rather; for when plague is raging he may use a long-haired tinctured wand, which afterwards he will burn. Sylvest. Penance. Diana p. 3 t. 4 R. 197. * Ità praesumptum probabiliter et qui addit; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si fiat sine necessitate, nec erit mortale.

Some presumptuously hold that there be but one unction in essence of the Sacrament; wherefore they think that in the peril of pestilence, and in like necessity, it sufficeth to have recourse once only to an organ more readily at hand, or rather to the very head itself. If a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is for ordinary election, not extraordinary, if it be made without necessity, will not be mortal. To be done and Teacher. Louvain. 32 art. 2. . » 5 tr. 8 cap. 3 qui eum non omnino improbabilem; » Tann. et Marchant. in Horto Pastorum, qui omnò probabilem, et in praxi usitatam, . 3 18 Lib. VI. Treatise.

V. Concerning the Last Unction, and citing for this purpose page 8, tome 1, part 21, Gran. Friend. The Pontiff, affirming that he is able to permit this, finally says in note 6 and Barbosa in c., in such a case to swiftly anoint one eye, ear, hand, and mouth with a form without the shape of a cross, saying that a single form encompasses the rest. Verum illud certius est, pedes aut renes ungere non esse essentiale; imo si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Renes, non est decens, praesertim in fe- ciuis et viris religiosis, ideoque omitti solet Henr.

Sa. It is asked whether the unction of the five senses is of the nature of a sacrament? The first opinion denies this, and states that only one anointing suffices for the value of the sacrament of the five senses. Thus Merbētius t. 2 p. 265 q. 19. Born in 306.

Likewise at Et [i.e., Ethicus] meritoriously (speaking speculatively) they deem probable Holzm n. 10: . 25: and Ratio, because from D. Jacobo simple anointing is prescribed, unguents are commanded oil. Furthermore in the Tridentine session 14 ch. 1 concerning a single anointing there is mention made, sacred chrism etc., hence it is inferred that if a confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, being as odious and strict as it is in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, for if a confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, being as odious and strict as it is in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. man shall be anointed in one part only, that it may be said that he has been unguated. The second opinion is more common and safer to affirm, and that is what the sixth [chapter] maintains with number 19. Good. Thomas Jacobi, et Concilium Tridentinum non fiat mentio plurium unctionum; tamen sic colligitur ex usu Ecclesiæ, et communi DD. sensu.

Therefore rightly do AA. aforementioned say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not for extraordinary; only during a time of pestilence or some other urgent necessity may this condition be applied, with one unction in any sense (and especially in the head), as

they say in Cap. I. Of Extreme Unction. Well. XIV.of the Council 1. 7. 18. Bus. ut supra.

Then it is said by Tourn. that if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which, if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election rather than extraordinary; it is said: God forgive thee whatever thou hast committed by sense, according to what is found in the Rituale Parisiense. But others, as Bus. soon below no. 3. Holzrn. et . ll. cc. item cum Angles, Nunno, et Leand. requirunt, ut exprimantur quinque sensus, nempe quidquid per visum, auditum, gustum, odoratum et tactum deliquisti. But it will be better to say thus: Through this Holy Unction may God grant you pardon for whatever you have fallen short in by means of sense perception, sight, hearing, taste, smell, and touch. Premising the word deliquit, that it may be well noted with Aversa, because if deliquit should be brought forward at the end, and in the meantime the sick man dies, there is no Sacrament.

Si vero æger supervivat, meritò dicit Croix n. 2121., repetendas esse unctiones in singulis sensibus addendo Orationes omissas. The Roman Ritual prescribes: If (the Priest) doubts whether he lives... let him proceed with unction under condition... saying: If you live, through this, etc. It is certain, however, that it is not necessary to apply a second unction in two parts, e.g., in both eyes, ears, etc., as they rightly say at n. 16; namely, if there be urgent necessity, namely, if there be danger of infection, or if the sick one cannot conveniently turn to another side, it suffices to anoint one eye, one ear, etc. The unction of the neck, as prescribes the Ritual, is always omitted in women from regard for modesty, and presumed not to be permissible in men when the sick one can conveniently move otherwise. The anointing of the feet is not of necessity a matter of the Sacrament, as commonly they say 17 in question 32 article 6; wherefore they say that in this anointing of the feet the Church has kept the custom to be observed. Nec praesumptum est de necessitate Sacramenti servare ordinem inter unctiones partium, quia hujus ordinis inversio minimè impedit Sacramenti significationem, Holzm, n. 11 cum communi, Communiter tamen di- §20 Lib. VI.

Treatise. V. Of Extreme Unction and Ordination, it contains forty sections,

chapter two at the end, when Bambast held this to be gravely illicit because it would be against the usage of the Church in a notable matter. « 3. On the essence of this Sacrament is. 1. That the five senses which are anointed be named.

The sect opposite section 4 etc. commonly holds; it is permissible to consider probable according to Diana page 8 tome 7 regulation 56 from Regin: that among those to be anointed all senses should suffice: By means of these holy anointings may indulgence be granted to you, etc. Those words, "Per hanc sanctam unctionem;" although Palaus I, c. says that it holds good, even if you omit the holy part. Words of prayerful petition: May God grant you indulgence. Here the form is imperative; for instance. By this, etc., may whatever be remitted to thee; it was said by Palaus I. in Capitulum Diana I. c. 3.

If anyone is chosen as a substitute confessor, it can be adequately confirmed through another three years after the time of the substitute, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which pertains to the form of this Sacrament; the Priest, dipping his thumb in holy oil in the manner of a cross, ought to anoint the sick person, as prescribes the Rite Romanum, in the places below written out, adapting the words of the form to their proper place thus: By this holy Anointment and His most merciful compassion may the Lord grant thee remission (if thou hast anointed thine eye, and so on). Amen. Minister vero, si est in sacris vel ipsemet Sacerdos post quamlibet unctionem terget loca inuncta novo globulo bombacius vel rei similis et aequae in vase mundi reponet et ad Ecclesiam postea deferet comburatur et cineres projiciat in sacrarium. The Rite itself also admonishes that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as binding on ordinary election rather than extraordinary, since when a Priest anoints parts of the body which are equal, such as eyes, ears, etc. (always beginning with the right side), he does not absolve the form until both calves have been touched. Si quis autem sit aliquo membro mutilatus, pars loco illi proxima eadem forma inungatur.

Then, having anointed the ears, he repeats the same form, saying, "through hearing." To the nostrils, through the sense of smell. To the mouth (with the lips pressed together), through taste, and speech... To the hands (for the priests externally, for the rest internally in the palms), through touch. To the feet (namely on the soles), through walking. To the kidneys,

through the delight in shadows.

Haec autem unctio omissa est in feminis, et praesumptum in viris, qui vix aut sine periculo mortis moveri non possunt. When however the danger of death is imminent, the Rituale prescribes that the sick one be anointed without delay with the aforementioned words: Through this Holy Anointing etc. And afterward, if he survives, the prayers omitted should be said. All these things are contained in the Rituale. The word "dalisquisti" merits being said according to Croix n. 2007, and against Bosco, from the essence; for otherwise it would not be expressed in the form of one of the principal effects of this Sacrament, which is the remission of sins, as D. Jacobus said: And if there are sins in it, they shall be remitted to him. The word however Sanctum is not of essence, since in Florence and Trent this word is not added; yet it omits sin nevertheless.

Thus commonly c. 2 n. 30 with Aversa, and Dicast. Doubt. 1. Is it a formal indicative? First they affirm what they hold Tourn. t. 9 and Juenin. Disputation 7, Question 4, Item Palud.

Alb. Great. Because. Rich. Aureol. et Tamner. apud Escob. n. 1 0 3 et probabilem putat Concinap. 1 7 n. 1 2.

It is approved by various ancient rituals, notably by the Ambrosian: Oil and ointment are sanctified in the name of the Father, etc., that as a soldier anointed may be properly prepared for combat, to overcome earthly powers. It is conformed to the intent of the mind and severity of doctrine, that way it does not hold: so be it. The. Suppl. q. 2 9. art. 8 pertotum, Merb. quæst. 2 0. Natal. from Alex., art. 3, section 40, note 6.

Ferrand. t r. 3 n. 8 0. Petrocor. t. 4 p. 184. . 4 n. 1. . 28. . 15 cumS. Good and Master. Escob. n. 1 0 5 cumHenr. Con.

Number and hurt and spoils 7 4 with Bellar. Val. etc., Ratio quit, habitured xippis verbis D. Jacobus: Et orationem suam supereuntiem, unguentum sue oleo.... et oratio fidati advenienti infernum. By these words, it is evident that the Apostle is allotted the efficacy of this Sacrament for prayer. Notwithstanding the ritual opposition; for it responds D. Th. 1. c, 223 Lib.

VI. Fraet. V. Regarding the Extreme Unction and Order, to 3: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary

one, those words are not the form of this Sacrament, but rather disposition for the form. But perhaps it responds better to Pope Benedict.

XIV. In Synode lib. 7 c. 17 et Sporer n. 75 cum Mastr. et Herincx: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; verba illa, ut possis, cum sint optativa, referri possint ad pro- ferentis votum et orationem, nempe ac si diceret: Ungo te orans Deum, ut possis, etc. Dubitatur 2. If these are of the essence: By Thy most merciful pity? The first proposition affirms this, and Nunnus and Hurt hold thus according to the note 15 in chapter 19, and Roncaglia considers it probable in question 3: that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is to be strictly and odiously understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. This word Misericordiam; however, Ratio doubts, because, since the form should be deprecatory, in it necessarily there must be explained recourse to divine misericordiam, which regards the misery in which one is most infirm at the end of life. The second, however, opinion is much more common and more probable, and this opinion is held by c. 2 n. 31., c. Sporer n. 71. n. 99. . Reg. Nam ratio contraria minimi sui detinet verba illa de essentia, quia si ipsum ipsa, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

Saoerdos dicat. May God grant you indulgence, and let it be sufficient to invoke divine mercy; yet all agree that if a Confessor is chosen for a supplement, it can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed in the election of an ordinary, not extraordinary one, would indeed be mortal if omitted, since this omission would be notable in a matter worthy of the Church's use. « Dub. 3. Let the form be valid if it is said: "I anoint thee with holy oil, that by His own mercy God may vouchsafe to forgive thee, etc." They deny this, chapter 2, note 29. Verely they more probably affirm. Fill.

Henry. Reg. and the rest commonly among them-dem. « 4. This sacrament shall only be given to the near relatives in case of death, or from a disease, wound, childbirth, or old age, because these alone are sick. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be rigorously interpreted concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, if those liberated by illness again endanger themselves, it must be done: namely, whenever there is anew danger of peril; nor should one wait (under grave sin, Quint: t. 5 sect. g.) until they lack sensation entirely or are utterly despairing. In dubio vero de vita detur sub conditione.

Thom. Sylv. : d. 40. Five. If it is given to one who suffers from a common disease, whether non-seriously or perilously afflicted, it is not valid, they allow that the contrary is probable as though anointing were again to be performed (presumptuously in the same illness), when he has begun to labor perilously: because of the changed state of infirmity, and Quintus adds that mortal sin had been committed. Quint. 4. 5 section 7, R. 45.

"Dubit." Is it asked whether this Sacrament of Extreme Unction is valid if it is conferred upon a sound person? Juvnin affirmat, secundum Ben. XIV, on the Synod 1. 8 c. 5 n. 4 (a) and Response Questions 6. R. 1. respondet: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Et anderet asserere esse validum, cum nullibi viderit condemnatum ritum Graecorum, qui in die Coena Domini dum consecraratur Oleum infirmorum ab Episcopo totum illud insumunt in ungendis abstantibus.

But certainly, it must be considered invalid according to common opinion, which is maintained in the Fourth Section, Second Chapter. SS. P. Bqned. XIV. 1. c. Ratio, quia: hoc patet ex verbis S. Jacobi capitis sexti, ubi dicitur: Infirmatur quis in vobis? indicat etc. Et communiter omnes interpretantur hunc textum de infirmitate corporali, non autem spirituali, ex sessio undecima capitulum tertium, ubi dicitur: Declaratur esse hanc untionem infirmis adhibendum. It does not hinder the rite of the Greek Church; for the aforementioned Pontiff wisely noted that to apply that unction to the healthy is not as a Sacrament (if a Confessor were chosen as a supplement, it could be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, pertains to ordinary election, not extraordinary; if a Confessor were elected as a

supplement, it could be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, for such a prohibition beyond three years is to be considered odious and strict in the case of an ordinary election, not extraordinary); rather as a mere ceremony and sacramental benediction.

Dubit. 2. Whether this Sacrament is valid if it is conferred to one who is suffering from any illness, presumed to be non-grave? The first opinion affirms, saying that it is indeed illicit but not invalid, and this is held by the 34th libellum. VI. Broken.

V. From the Decretals and Order, Concionator dated December 19, number 25, and Ratio, namely because the Apostle recognizes absolutely the sick person as a subject capable of this Sacrament when he says: Who is weakened among you? Let it be brought forward etc., because in the Decree of Trent chapter 3 thus it is stated: It is declared to be presumptuous to use this anointing for the sick; but those who are lying so dangerously as to seem to have been constituted ready for the exit from life are excepted, wherefore also the Sacrament of the departing is called. Where it notes the word especially, and from this they infer that this Sacrament can also be administered to those who do not lie dangerously ill. However, the more widespread and to-be-followed opinion teaches that such a communion is not merely illicit, but also invalid.

Thus concludes the discussion. d. 42 sect. 2 n. 4 et 5. Escob. 1, 23, n. 138 cum Diana; Th. in IV, d. 23, qu. 2, art. 4 q. 2, ubi docet, hoc Sacramentum non esse dan-dum nisi infirmis, qui secundum humanam aestimationem videntur morti appropinquare. It is proved from the Decree. Eugenii IV. in Instruct ad Armenos, ubi dictum fuit: Hoc sacramentum dari non debet, nisi infirmo, de cujus morte timetur. The word moreover does not merely bring forward a precept here, but also necessity, because the aforementioned Pontiff, when he declared the subject of this Sacrament and designated only the infirm of whose death there is fear, considered others to be excluded as being indeed infirm.

It is confirmed from the end of the institution of this Sacrament, which was (as he says) that this Sacrament might fortify the end of life as it were with some very firm protection. It does not hinder, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, that it may be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. This matter shall particularly be stated in chapter three, since this particular point, according to the context of the Council, does not mean that any infirm person may receive the Sacrament at any time,

but rather it means that the Sacrament can be given to those who lie in extreme peril, even if they are not constituted for the exit from life or at the point of death; provided only that imminent danger of death is present, as shall be declared shortly at the end of Doubt fourth. Dubium 3. Hoc Sacramentum sit ministrandum una mulieri laborantia in partu? Response: if a woman is in labor with common pains only, not even groaning, and whether she is delivering for the first time or has been in danger of death previously, because then she still is not laboring perilously by infirmity according to what DD. infra quoted from the Council of Milan say below where it was said: A parish priest should not administer the Sacrament of Unction to women in labor.

Secondly. But if a woman has already begun to suffer excruciating tortures such that she is now actually in imminent danger of death: because then indeed she is already dangerously infirm; thus Fill. tr. 3 n. 68. Diana page 10, translation 12. R. 9 with Frauc. Lugo, et Amico, ac . It is doubted 4.

Whether this sacrament can lawfully be conferred to a sick person in sole judgment, considering a thought of mortal danger? The first opinion denies this, and those who hold this view are called probablem. According to Ratio (as they say), it cannot be considered a danger of being frustrated; for if seriously ill, it would be invalidly conferred, since the one administering sacramentously is not in true danger of death. However, the second opinion is common and true, and it is held thus: 42nd section 2 note 5. Sporer n. 98: with Scotus and Amicus, and Escob. num. 138 with Gaspenz. Grace is so weighed down by a very grave illness that it prudently fears to be in the danger of imminent death.

And it is confirmed by the decree of Eugene, as aforementioned, where it states: Of whose death fear is entertained. And from the Rituale, where it is stated: This Sacrament should be ministered to the infirm, who... labor so gravely that the peril of death seems imminent. And the reason is, because Christ our Lord left behind this Sacrament's ministerial function for men, we must believe that He did so leave it, that they might be permitted to grant it to all the infirm; whose death's danger is probingly judged to be imminent. But to be noted here is this: if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can beneficially be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary rather than extraordinary election. For this reason, one does not expect the last days of life for administering this Sacrament; hence, commonly they teach. Book.

Question 25.

Monday 5th. Roncag. Obs. 1: graviter peccare parochos, qui differunt hoc sacramentum, usquedum infirmus privetur usu sensuum et rationis; prout habetur praesumptum expressum in catech. Rom. § 9 ubi dicitur: Gravissim peccant, qui illud tempus aegroti ungendi observare solent, cum jam omni salutis spe amissa et sensibus carere incipiat. Reason, quia sic privatur infirmus posteriori fructu, quem receperitisset si suscepiisset hoc Sacramentum dum erat rationis compos; et cum tunc se ad illud disposuerit; item quia privatur spiritualibus viribus ad resistendum daemoni et ad perferenda morbi incommoda; item quia infirmus, si forte esset in peccato mortali et rationis compos, hoc Sacramentum suscepiisset, forte gratiam attritionis auxilium accepisset qua alioquin privaretur; demum quia virtute hujus Sacramenti sanitatem corporis fortasse consecutus esset si tempore congruo collatum fuisset; licet hoc Sacramentum per virtutem quadam supernaturali praesumptum salutem corporalem operetur, ut loquitur Tridentinum, non tamen per modum miraculi operatur sed via quodammodo ordinaria nempe causas naturales adjuvando ut communiter ajunt DD.

Which all things piled together seem to bring a great hurt to the sick person,... It must be adverted that if some Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict in being received for ordinary election, and not extraordinary, should be distinguished when Extreme Unction ought to be given, and when it may be given. There indeed exists the obligation, as we have already said, to administer this sacrament out of fear for the proximate danger of death, and then it is not to be waited for until the last moment of life but ought to be administered, as Be- nedit commands, congruously. XIV. in Euchol. Greekorum. (vide Bull. 53 in valide et licite statuendum esse Extremam Unctionem dabundi ac prudentissime judicatur infirmus laborare periculo mortis; etsi adhuc non proximae: ita ubi ait: Ut minimum requiritur, ut ex tali infirmitate maris possit moraliter timari saltem remota. The same regarding Cpt Coninch. dub. 7 n. 24.

Castrop. tr. 26 p. 6 n. 12. Escob. de 3o n. 138. Holzrn. idem tit. n. 28. Sporer n. 98. XIV de Synodo t. 2 p. 211. et Honoratus Tournely de hoc probatur i ex Concilio Florentino (t. 13.

Council, p. 538) in the decree where it is said: The subject of this Sacrament to be one who is infirm of whose death there is fear. It is proved from 3: Thisunction to be administered to the infirm, and

especially to those who seem destined for the exit from life. That particle praiseth sufficiently to indicate that Extreme Unction can be ministered presumptively to sick persons who do not yet seem to be at the point of death. Consequently, the third is more strongly confirmed from the aforementioned Bull 53 Benedict. XIV. cited § 46 where it is written: Let the Sacrament of Extreme Unction not be administered to those who are benevolent, but only to those who suffer from grave illness.

Hence rightly says Castropalaus (1.c. n. 12 Quapropter censerem, quoties viaticum infirmo ministratur, statim et ministrari Unctionem posse, et expedire; quia jam censetur infirmitas grave periculum vitæ inducere. In dubio autem, an infirmitas sit periculosa rectè ajunt Castropalaus ibid., n. 13 et: Non posse Extremam Unctionem ministrari tum quia præceptum est, ne aliis quàm via pericliantibus ministratur. But if there is a real probability of such peril, or a prudent fear, as commonly taught by the Doubtful (Dubit. 4), When can this Sacrament again be ministered to that same sick person? It is replied: When the illness is not prolonged, it requires that this sacrament be administered again, so that the infirm may first have recovered from their initial illness... and fallen into another similar division of life, as taught when indeed illnesses are prolonged, such as in cases of consumption and dropsy, then Saint Charles Borromeo thus instructs: If one has a weight hanging over him that threatens to crush him, let him take off his shoes; give 22& Lib.

VI. Treatise. V. From the Second Part, Question Two, Article Four. The same precept of the Roman Rite saying.

In ea ipsa infirmitate hoc Sacramentum iterare non debet, nisi diuturna sit, ut cum infirmus convaluerit iterum in periculum mortis incidat. Wherefore observe, if any one be chosen as a substitute Confessor, he can suitably be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood, like the strict and odious rule concerning regular election, not irregular. In case of a prolonged illness, if the sick man has remained in the same danger of death after the unction, he will certainly not be able to receive it again. According to N. SS., however, it is said. P. Bened. XIV. (de nobis optimè meritus) de Synodo t. 2 p. 224 si dubitetur, an reverà morbi status multitutus sit; tunc enim dict expedire ad Sacramenti iteratio- rem. propendere, eo si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac-cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia

prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. hæc sit uniformior veteri.

The ecclesiastical custom shall be observed, and thereby a new spiritual assistance may come to the sick. This, however, is to be understood in case of positive doubt, namely when it is probable that the sick has already passed out of the danger of death; for otherwise, in mere negative doubt, one must observe the prescription of Trent, where it is said that the Sacrament can be administered if the sick have recovered. If a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict as it is to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, is that which, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict as it is to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. This can only be verified reverently if not at least probably out of the danger. Wherefore Chapter 5 with canons 6. To receive this sacrament with fruit, in one who is composed by reason and conscious of mortal sin (if he does not confess), contrition at least estimated is required; nor is attrition sufficient. Bonac. d. 7. q. un. p. 5 n. 2 ex Reg. 1. 28 cap. ult. Article 73 * (See the aforementioned note n. 86 and previously n. 33.) * However, ordination is to be administered unless a reasonable cause prevents it (e.g.,

» If on account of vomiting communication is not possible, the confession and communion are to be postponed because of the Church's constitution, which postpones unction as something less necessary for salvation. See Bonaventura loc. cit. § 13 * (in Ritu. *) Rome, thus it is held: From generation Chapter I. Concerning Extreme Unction. - It is ecclesiastical custom to observe that if time and the intimate condition permit, before the administration of Extreme Unction, Confession and the Eucharistic Sacrament should be offered to the sick. To receive Extreme Unction before Viaticum will be neither a sin; nor will it be venial, as they say, Suur. d. 44 sect. 1 n. 2 et Croix n. 2120, and Bened does not condemn it.

XIV. De Synod. tot. 2 p. 220 quia consuetudo praemittendi Viaticum non est recepta saltem sub gravi obligatione.) Licet autem, per se loquendo, confessio non necessario praemittatur, cum per contritionem se disponere possit; tamen accidens requirere potest, v.g. si post Viaticum peccasset mortaliter et timeretur ne post Unctionem desisteret tempus confessionis: tunc enim prius audiendus et absolvens esset; quia sacramenta magis

necessaria talis casu prius sumenda sunt. Fillius 5, titulus 3, responsio 92, sectio 7. Children who possess the sufficient use of reason to sin, even though they do not receive the sacred Eucharist, are not improperly denied the Extreme Unction, since their salvation sometimes depends on it. 70 sect. 1. Griff. . apud .5 t 8 c 4 n 2, qui excusat Parochos quorumdam locorum, per consuetudinem toleratam a Episcopis, si non dent pueris ante annum 14 vel 15 excepto casu necessitatis, quo puer rationis usum consecutus esse constet; aliud Sacramentum ante mortem suscipere non possit. See Penalty. C. 5 Q. 17.

And although the parish priest, in the confession, may have come to know that the boy has never actually sinned, I nonetheless must anoint him, contrary to the teaching of Nugentius and Sancius . - 4 R. 181. If however there is a doubt whether the boy has the use of reason, he must be anointed under the condition that he is to do so. q t. 3 R. 85 et Sanc. Zamb. et Card. de Lugo. It is doubted 1. Whether infants are capable of this Sacrament?

The first opinion affirms what the Major holds and 1.22 n. 109 states. Reason, because this Sacrament—3 6 Lib VI. Treatise. V. From the Treatise on the Last Rites and Order. The anointing not only is given for the remission of actual sins, but also for the removal of remaining traces of original sin, for the recovery of health, and for the acquisition of grace increasing. But the second common and true opinion denies this; and this opinion hold St. Thomas, Supplement, q. 32, art. 4.

Bellarmine: on the Eucharist. U. c. g. . 42 sect. i n. 3. n. 94. cum Soto, Fill. ubi: Debet autem hoc Sacramentum tamis praberi, qui ad usum rationis venerint. Reason, because (as D. Thomas says), this form of the Sacrament does not suit children; hence, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in the matter of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, because they have not sinned through hearsay and sight, as the form expresses. To the reason of the opposite [argument], responds the same Sacred Doctor: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementarity, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, is to be understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Extreme Unction is not given for the abolition of the relics of original sin, but for actual sins to be removed.

As regards the effect of health, it is responded, if a Confessor be chosen for

supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, since this would cease with the cessation of the primary effect of this Sacrament. As regards the increase of Grace, since this is given only as connected to the proper effect of the Sacrament, when the subject is not capable of the proper effect, he is also not capable of increase. It is no obstacle if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, that it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For although some assert (as Maldonatus and Pope Benedict XIV respond in the Synodum 2d tome page 203), if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Perhaps, if they were unctioned, then that action would rather be a sacramental blessing, as stated about the action of the Greeks n. 713. Dubit. 2. Whether this Sacrament can be conferred upon children whose use of reason is in doubt? The first proposition denies this, and this opinion is held by Sotus, n. 112. For if a child truly lacks the use of reason, the sacrament is frustrated; and since this is not necessary for salvation, it should not be exposed to such danger.

The second opinion affirms what is held by Raynaud. The third opinion, however, is more probable, than (beyond) Chapter I. On Extreme Unction. with, and Lugo apos. Bus.) hold Renzi of E. U. c. 2 q. 3 et dicunt, tales pueros ungendos esse sub conditione, quia per conditio- nem jam salvatur reverentia Sacramenti, et aliunde justa adest causa illud ministrandi sub conditione, ne priventur pueri fructu tam salutare hujus Sacra- menti; juxta dicta n. 28.

Doubt. 3. Whether it is possible to administer the Extreme Unction to a child who has now reached the age of seven years and therefore can understand the concept of sin, but is still not capable of receiving Communion? The first opinion denies what Sotus and Aureol. n. 115 held at a certain Synod of Seville; and it seems to favor what is said in question 32 article 4, where it states: The Eucharist and this Sacrament should not be given to children so congruously. Reason; firstly because this accords with the common practice of the Church; secondly because it seems unfitting to administer this Sacrament to a boy who in that state can hardly be instructed concerning its effect. The second however opinion is more common and probable, which those hold n. 94. cam. 107. eum Sa,

Val. Sancio, et Zambr.

And the same is taught by Pope Benedict. XIV. De quo dict, minimè approbandam esse quamdam Synodum, in qua statutum fnerat non dandum hoc Sacramentum pueris, qui non communicarunt; et approbat, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Tradit Rituale Argentinense nempe non denegandam Extremam-Untcionem pueris septennibus ac iis in quibus malitia supplet aetatem etsi ad septennium non pervenerint. Nor does it hinder the covered allusion of D. Thomae; for there (as he says in ad 2) this Sacrament excludes from its participation only those youths who are devoid of reason and are incapable of actual sins. Dubit. 4. Can the Extreme Unction be given immediately after Baptism to a seventh-degree adult who is infirm?

He denies this according to Sanctius because through Baptism all remnants of sin have already been removed, but commonly and rightly affirm it. IV section 3 n. 9. Renzi concerning two questions number two. Diana page 5, translation 3, rubric 82. eam Vega, from the libellus. VI. Pull.

V. Regarding the Extrema Unction and Order, both in reason and because through Baptism the remnants of actual sins committed before Baptism are not truly removed, inasmuch as they are torpor with regard to good and predisposition toward evil; also because the primary effect of this Sacrament is not so much the remission of sins, but the strengthening of the weak against the temptations of the Devil, as they say. Section 4r, part i, n. i. They infer this from the words of the Apostle: "The Lord will strengthen him." Minister est solus Sacerdos proprius, sive Pastor: sine cujus venia si extra necessitatem alius det, validum quidem est, sed graviter peccat. 9 n. 28. « (Est commune ut . 5 n. 3. Moreover, any priest can minister this Sacrament upon consent probabliby presumed by the Parochi or his representation? It denies that a religious incurs a papal excommunication when he ministers this sacrament or Viaticum to his relatives in extremis without the permission of the parish priest; it teaches thus: however, the rule can minister this sacrament, like Viaticum, to their relatives at the point of death. This is according to Bulla apud qua incipit, Immarcescibilem, issued in 1567 by St. Pius V who granted the Theatins permission not only to administer Extreme Unction to Brothers and Clerics of said Congregation but also to presumed mercenaries, workers, servants, and families thereof, as well as any presumed secular guests and strangers who may have been found in the places or habitations of said Congregation at the point of death, and whenever there might be doubt

about it, presumed permission being sought without request from the parish priests.

Item Sextus IV. (it is found in Pittoni de) concedidit Regularibus dare Eucharistiam et Extremam Unctionem suis paenitentibus, si Parochus injuste ea negaverit vel malitiosè distulerit. » In necessitate vero, ut si Pastor absit, vel dare nolit, nec Superior possit adiri pro petenda licentia, licite ministrat quivis non excommunicatus aut suspensus, praesumptum Regularis, ut contra Gravant docent Laymann. Regulari c. * (Ita praesumptum communiter. 44 sect. 3 n. 3. 43. when with XIV from cum.

Arm. et . apud) Et idem docuit S. Carolus p. 4 ubi concessit cuilibet sacerdoti dare hoc sacramentum deficiente parocho. But moreover, whether a Pastor, having been ordained, can minister Extreme Unction? Assert and they consider it probable there. File. et . disp. 44 sec. 3 n. 6. With Henry and those who say otherwise regarding the suspended pastor: namely, probaby if another is absent). * 9.

A sufficient thing is for a priest without a minister in necessity; neither is a woman to be employed there; if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. If, however, this happens, it teaches that it would be venial. (As presumptuous is the dictum 'to minister without a minister,' nullifying any presumed sin due to necessity being removed, they say and when the Host is present. And 9, T: 6, R: 46; 7, C: 2, and n: 106, from the Roman Ritual where it is said: When clerics have been convened, at least one, etc. * (In that could a presumed one anoint another part, albeit pronouncing the form suitable for that anointing. Bon. l. c. etc. comm. * (Ita praesumptum cum communi, . 43 sect. 2 n. 4. . 7 n. 7. cum Con. et Hoc tamen intelligendum cum AA. citatis, licere in solo casu Lib. 354. VI. Treatise.

V. On the Extremes-Unition and Order. Necessity, namely, if a sick person fears his imminent death, it would be mortal sin for others; because contrary to the usage of the Church, as rightly noted by him with the common opinion. It is certain that however one Sacerdottem sufficere est ad ministrandum hoc Sacramentum, ut docet D. 2100 et patet ex c. Quesivit de Verb sign ubi: Sacerdos uno praesente Clerico, et praesumptum solus potest infirmum ungere. The Greeks, however, employ seven Priests (as Arcud says; but Benedictus XIII permitted them in the year 1724 to anoint one person if neither seven nor three could be had). Nevertheless, one would not be able to anoint a certain sense and another pronounce the

organ (as the presumptuous with the Dictionary and community state), nor one an eye and another the other.

If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood in the context of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood in the context of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the Priest cannot proceed, they shall be supplied by another, which remain. 87 notes that it is permissible for the presumed other to repeat the anointings from the beginning as if the prior had not commenced them at all (But better: When a Priest is lacking between anointings, if another immediately supplies these, they are not to be repeated beforehand easily, as Cum Dicit.). Poss. Fill. Mulf. et Soc. Caroli » p. 4.

Thus, if unctions are supplied by another after some notable delay (for example, after a quadrant); then all unctions should be repeated under the condition; as rightly says Croix with Aversa, Merat., and Nunno.) Dubit, whether the Priest incurs irregularity if the sick person dies while the Priest is caring for him by preparing to anoint? They correctly deny it with reference to Cornio, from the same [authority]. Bonaventura de Irreg. d. 7 q. 4 p. 7 n. 12 cum Suarez et communi, nempe si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Irregularitas non incurritur nisi per dilitum, a quo est immunis qui officium charitatis exercet. 726 » 10. Even so, in the administration of this sacrament, all things are prescribed in the Ritual, Agenda, Cap. I. On the Extreme Unction.

» or Manuali, yet still it is taught by Quint. and 1 R. 79 that it should not be administered mortally without a cope or chasuble in necessity. » This excuses from every sin if the sick one is not capable of receiving another Sacrament and this cannot be administered; it is questioned whether a mortal sin is committed by the Priest ministering the Extreme Unction or vestments prescribed namely the superpelliceum and stola; certainly, if necessity does not urge, he will undoubtedly sin gravely; it is doubtful when necessity urges. The first opinion affirms, and consequently . 44 sect. 2 n. 7. n. 120. . 46. et with Naldo, and others; because the reverence for the Sacrament is to be preferred to any private utility. The subsequent

opinion holds that a presumption is not probable, and this view is held by Croix n. 2116. Diana p. 9 t. 6 R. 46 cum Leand. et cum Possev. et Quintanad., in casu quo vestes de esse nt, et infirmus decederet sine Sacramento; quia licet sacramento hoc non sit necessarium est tamen valde utile unde non præsumitur Christus qui illud instituit ad subsidium infirmorum in ultimo agone pugnantium voluisse eos ne vestes omittantur tanto bono privari.

See the aforementioned regarding a similar case from the treatise on the Eucharist, number forty-one, verse five. To be ministered. "However, a presumed matter outside necessity is not mortal." 727 1. To omit the penitential Psalms, litanies, and other prayers teaches. I say, extra [i.e., outside], because in a serious necessity, for example, during a time of plague or when death is imminent, one ought to be immediately granted prayers without delays; which however are to be subsequently supplied if the sick person recovers.

Bonaventura, d. 7, p. 6, n. 8: Here it must be distinguished: To omit Prayers prescribed in the Rituale, outside cases of necessity, without doubt is mortal, as rightly they say. L. 6, § 4, n. 1. 46. and n. 7. I have said outside of necessity; for if the danger of death be imminent to the sick person, the Rituale itself prescribes that, should a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict and to be received as concerning the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one. If a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict and to be received as concerning the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one. The sick person should speedily be anointed...and (if...survive) let him say 236 Lib VI. Treatise. V. Of the Extreme Unction and in Order. were omitted the Prayers.

They similarly probably say with . Day and common, if a Priest is in danger of infection. To omit however the Penitential Psalms and litanies, Bon. l. c. says that it is not a mortal sin, and very clearly states that it is a venial sin. But I think more probable with . In the Ritual concerning them it is said thus only: While the sick are anointed with holy oil, they are said by those present to have bent knees...728.

To refer to the sick, or to allow them to be anointed with light. Leand. citing 5 secf. 13 c. 22. * (Italy also 6 R. 46 et) * 3. If he administers alone without a minister: otherwise they permit this in necessity. 9 treatise 6 R.

36 (see what is said number 724.) * 4. If he anoints otherwise than in the form of a cross: generally it is considered that only venial sin ought to omit the sign of the Cross when being anointed; thus it is stated in Decretals 40 section 2 note 3 chapter 2 note 14 and Escob. number 90 with Con. and Zambr. But Escobar holds even to omit this [sign] would be a venial sin; yet I do not agree with this unless necessity demands it.

Here too this is to be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict that it must be interpreted for ordinary election, not for extraordinary. This prescribes the Rituale: if another Presbyter or Diaconus may be present, who brings holy oil, let him bring it through him; he clad in a shroud following secretly the Viaticum-bearing Priest, and after the sick person has received Viaticum, let him be anointed by the Priest. Furthermore, they permit the Priest to interrupt the Mass in order to administer Extreme Unction, if no other Sacrament can be conferred upon the sick person: because if he is sufficiently disposed, he can obtain the first grace. * Chapter I. Of the Extreme Unction. • 11. Pastor ratione officii tenetur sub mortali dare iis qui petunt, nisi justa causa excusat, praesumptum tem pore pestis, modo possit absque periculo vitae; cum eo enim non teneri, docent g3. If those infected with pestilence have confessed, they can be absolved absolutely without sin, teaches the same.

R. 174 et p. 5 tr. 3 res. 83 et g3 et p. 8 tr. 1 res. 21 ex ll. cc. * (Regulariter igitur non tenetur Pastor cum periculo vitae dare hoc Sacramentum, nisi infirmus à longo tempore sit confessus, et verisimiliter censetur esse in mortali; ita communiter . > Section 44, Chapter 3, Note 20. But rather others say, unless he knows it more probably, according to what is said in n. 624. A priest who has been cured commits a mortal sin if he neglects or postpones anointing the sick with probable danger, so that he may die without unction unless a just cause excuses him, because in such a serious matter it is not sufficient; and if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be properly confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, is held from justice. * (Italian commentary) * Another priest, however, if absent the Parochial priest, is bound by charity alone, albeit only under a venial sin, provided he can do so licitly and easily. * (Italian similarly commonly Laym, c. 7 n. 3.) Pal p. 8 n. 16: et) * Nisi tamen aegrotus valde indigeret; v. gr., si alioqui sine omnibus sacramentis esset moriturus; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium

prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Aliud nullum suscipere possit; tunc enim quidem graviores obligationem agnoscere videntur. 4.

R. 170. . 5 t. 8 c. 7 n. 3. * (Ità pariter cum communi . n. 9 contra) * » 13. Parochialis vesperi timenti, ne noctu vocetur ad ægrum; non licet retinere domi sacrum oleum, ut vocatus possit venire expeditius, licet veniam culpam in eo tantum agnoscat Barbos. de Par. c. 22 238. Library. VI. Treatise.

V. Of the Last Unction and Order. From Possess. * (Indeed even Indeed probably said Croix no. 2114 with Arriaga, and Gob. in this not to have sinned the parishioner if he believed it would be called at night; and danger would arise that having been called, he might come late.) * also Quintan. tr. 5 l. 10 where nevertheless from mortal daring is not dared to excuse him who always remained at home.* (with Escob. d. n. 226) * 33. » 14. It is fitting that flax be burned: because for each particular anointing new oil must be used, unless there is something else in the agenda. c. Sa. (In Rituali thus it is held; if the minister is present at the sacries or if the priest himself after any anointment targes the places anointed with a new globulus of bombax or similar substance and puts them in a clean vessel; and afterwards brings them to the church, burns them, and offers the ashes propitiatorily in the sanctuary.) Resp. 2.

The primary effect is to strengthen the army against the temptations of the demons in death. Secondarily is it, to erase the remains of sins, (or a part according to the disposition of the recipient:) 2. To remove remaining penalties * (not indeed all, but .*) Question 30, Article 1. Laym, c. 5 n. 3.

c. 3 n. 5.) * 3. Aliquaudò presumes that the health of the body » is conferred, if it is expedient. S. Th. Sylv. . 41 sect. 1 (as in 2 where it is said: And the health of the corporal sometimes follows when the health of the soul has been promoted,) it commonly happens between doctors that this Sacrament remits both venial and mortal sins if these infirmities are invincibly unknown, and there be contrition, so that the obstacle to sin may be removed; as S. Thomas Aquinas, Supplement, q. 30, art. 1, where he says: (But because this strength of grace makes it incompatible with sin, consequently, if a sin, whether mortal or venial, is found in respect to guilt, it removes that without being placed as an obstacle on the part of the recipient; which corresponds above all to the Eucharist and

Confirmation as previously stated.) The Doctors follow Bellarmine de E.

U. c. 8. Wood m. n. 36. Val. Chapter I. On the Last Transaction. This is clearly gathered from the words of D. Jacob: And if there are any sins, they shall be remitted to him. And from 2 where it says: Whose anointing removes sins if any are still to be expiated and the remains of sins; Whether, however, mortal sins are remitted to this infirm man of himself, or by accident?

The first opinion, which Gonet holds in T. 6, p. 479. Holzrn. 1. c. Et hoc sententiae videtur favere. c. dicendo: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; hoc Sacramentum re- mittat peccata, congruent Eucharistia, et Confirmatio, quae certè per accidens remittunt. The second opinion, however, is more probable and more common, which is held by Tournay 1. c., Habert t. 6 p. 525, etc., namely, Extremam. To remit mortal sins by itself, although consequentially. The reason is, although this Sacrament is for the living, nevertheless it remits sins by divine institution, as is evident from the words of the Apostle as mentioned above; and it is confirmed in the Canon 2 where it says: If anyone shall say that the anointing of the sick does not confer grace, nor remit sins, nor alleviate the sick... let him be anathema.

And unreasonably, says Belharm, when. In hoc autem differunt Baptismus et Pœnitentia a Extrema Unctione, quia illa principaliter instituta sunt ad delendum peccatum actualis vel originalis; Extrema verò unctio (ut docet ; sed quia, cum in anima reperitur peccatum, non possunt tolli reliquiae, nisi prius tollatur peccatum; ideò ex consequentio hoc Sacramentum peccatum auit. The principal effect of this Sacrament is according to the Book. VI. Treatise.

V. Of the extreme remission of sins, at least venial sins? Bonaventura affirms. By Scotus and other Scotists commonly; likewise article number 170. But others commonly and more probabily say that the principal effect of this Sacrament is to remit the remnants of sins as has been said above; for otherwise he who did not have actual sins would not be capable of the principal effect of it, if some Confessor were chosen as a supplement, he could be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. It is false that, if someone were chosen as Confessor for the supplement, he could be sufficiently confirmed

by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, applies to ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Thus S. Th. 1. c., quem sequuntur Gonet p. 475, eum communi, ut asserit, et cum 73a: "Hujus Sacramenti non sunt capaces, i." Boys, before the use of reason: even though that age is sufficient, it is capable of sinning. Navar. . c. 2. Perpetually amen; but for those who are delirious, if they have asked before, or would ask if they thought about it, or showed a sign of pain, it can be given and should be given, Sylvest. Henr. However, with regard to the infirm, who while in a sound mind and with intact senses sought that; or who, verisimilitudinously, might have sought it, or who gave signs of contrition, even though subsequently they may have lost speech or become insane, or should delirium take hold, or if they do not feel, nevertheless their petition is valid. But those who are insane can be anointed with good oil, if they have a clear interval, according to 32 a. g.

In doubt, however, whether a sick person ever had the use of reason and was once anointed: (understand under condition) as the Croix says n. 2111. with Gob. and Lohn. from the Rituali, where it is said: Anointing those who die in manifest mortal sin (and) sacramental penance is denied to excommunicated persons (Sacramentum). They can also be anointed (said Croix d. n. 2110. cum Con.). In time, interdicted ministers are forbidden to administer this Sacrament, ex c. Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. In thee, of penance and remission.) * And if such anointing resists, they are to be bound or firmly held, said Cap. I. On the Last Entombment. 3 res. 84 qui cum c. 22 dict esse necessarium, quando phreneticus non potest aliud Sacramentum suscipere. And this is fitting for him if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. The addition to the Rite says: If a sick person, while he labors under frenzy or madness, veridically could do something against the reverence of the Sacrament, he must not be anointed unless all danger is entirely removed.

Blind and deaf from birth are capable thereof; therefore they should be

anointed at the organs of the senses by which they lack: although they might not have sinned externally through them, yet they could have sinned through interior powers which correspond to those. Possessed. Nald. Preface. (thus presumptuously in S., with the common) against Crex n. 1875. with Gob. etc. » (and the same S. Carolus taught p. 4.)* » 3.

To refuse this Sacrament, per se considering it, secluded from scandal and with contempt, is not a mortal sin. Italiana. (Much less do domestic servants sin mortally by neglecting this, if they do not provide it.) Nevertheless, they are taught to be venial sins. d. 19 Feb. 20 contra Nugnum. 4 R. 170 et p. 8 t. 1 R. 58 et p. 5 t. 3 R. 97, ubi notat ex Tann. non censeri contemnere, qui sciens prudens omittit tempore apto, et oblata commoditate. » However, it wishes that henceforth there be no contrary opportune occasion.

» It is questioned whether there is an obligation to receive this Sacrament with great readiness? The first sentiment affirms, and maintains this position, 10. Habert t. 6 p. 541. Bonnefons et P. Soto, malgré cela, utilisent ces mêmes AA. pour des raisons différentes; en opposition avec l'amour de soi-même. Others, however, because the words of Apostolic authority lead the priests, introduce a precept.

The second opinion is common (as Merbesius himself admits), and sufficiently probable; they hold this, section 42, paragraph 1, note 2; paragraph 2, note 4. Croix n. 2113. Spor, — . 16 242 Lib. VI. Treatise.

V. On Extreme Unction, and with Marshland. Cov. et Dom. Soto, with and Gabriels and with Gons. Sa, Val. et Henr. item Estius, Sylvius, et Sambov. secundum Habert l. c. ex Digesto I art. 1 quaestio 3 ad 1 ubi ait Sacramenta tam Confirmationis quam Extremorum Unitonis non esse de necessitate salutis.

Reason, because such an obligation is neither derived from the institution of this Sacrament, since it is not necessary for salvation but only useful and conducive to betterment; nor from a divine precept, since Theologians commonly do not interpret the words of the Apostle as constituting a precept, but rather as counsel. Hence, since this Sacrament is instituted merely for greater utility, it does not seem to oblige charity towards oneself gravely; for charity does not obligate under a grave precept to do that, if someone is chosen as Confessor as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, to be understood of

ordinary election and not of extraordinary. It is better thus. Non obstante tamen hoc, prima sententia mihi etiam probabilis et omnino suadenda apparet; non tam ratione præcepti, quia de eo saltèm non constat; quàm ratione charitatis ergà seipsum; nam licet moribundus possit aliis præsidiis se roborare; tamen in tali statu constitutus, ex una parte cum magna difficultate ad bonos actus se valet excitare, quia vires propriæ tunc sunt debiliores propter mentis oppressionem; et ex altera vehementiores sunt (ut ait Tridentinum) dæmonii insidie; unde ingenti periculo se exponere videtur qui negligit se munire hoc Sacramento à Christo Domino instituto, tamquam firmissimo præsidio in tanto conflictu. All nevertheless agree, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, as odious and strictly to be received is concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For it might happen accidentally that an infirm person could commit mortal sin by omitting to receive this Sacrament; namely, a penalty if he omitted having the consciousness of mortal sin, and would not be able to receive another Sacrament; thus commonly Palau p. 8 n. 3., and Suarez Aversa, and others in various places; but they well say. Secondly, si scandalum daret, puta si ratione circumstantiarum alii inducerent ad suspicandum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; ipse sit haeresicus vel ad nihili faciendum hoc Sacramentum; ita et cum Bon. et communi.

Thirdly, on account of contempt, as commonly stated by the aforementioned Doctors, and is manifest in the fact that a mere contempt for sacred things without a great sin... could not be tolerated. Whether, however, he who knowing and willing it neglects to receive this Sacrament, is said to contempt it? They affirm, Merbesius and others. But more commonly and more probingly Suarez n. 6 denies this, namely not him who does not wish to receive it on account of some repugnancy, or because he thinks that it is not a commandment. And this agrees with it, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, said Martinus V. in the Bull of Constantiae (as Merbeius

reports in question 10) where he said: This Sacrament (namely, Extreme Unction) neither can be neglected without fault, nor can be despised without mortal sin.

Whereupon it seems that the Pontiff has sufficiently expressed himself when he said: if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed through another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary, implies a grave contempt worthy of serious culpability, whereas negligence does not exceed a slight fault. See what has been said about the Sacraments, which to this Sacrament are presumed to be congruous. ## CAPUT II. ## OF THE SACRAMENT OF Orders. ## DUBIUM I. ### What is an Order, and how many in number, and of what is its matter? 754 What is the Sacrament of Orders, and how many are there Ordines? And whether the first tonsure is an Order? What is Ordination, and what is an Order? And what are the effects of ordination? Definition of any Ordination. Whether each of the seven Orders is a Sacrament? The Opinion of the Author. Whether Episcopal Office is a distinct Order from Priesthood? What is the remote matter and what the proximate matter of this Sacrament? Question in Doubt 1.

Whether the matter and form of the Order be determined specifically by Christ? (De Sacram.) §44 Lib. VI. Treat. V. On the Last Unction and Order. §41 Doubt 2.

A Latin order is properly assigned according to the Greek matter appointed. §42 Dub. 3. Is a requirement for the contact of instruments? §43 Dub. 4. Is there a physical contact required? §44 Does it need to be said by the same Bishop in form, and handed over in matter? And whether a Mass should be celebrated by the same one who bestows Orders? §45 Concerning the matter of each Order. Whether the tradition of the acolyte includes the handing over of pitchers or a candlestick? §46 Qu.

I. What is the matter and form of a Subdeacon? Dub. 1. Whether a chalice with a paten or a book of Epistles? §47 Dub. 2. Whether a chalice and a paten should be consecrated?

And whether a subdeacon sins gravely by ministering with mortal sin? Referred back to number 38. Section 48 Qu. II. What is the matter and form of Diaconate? §49 Qu. III.

What is the matter and form of Priesthood? §50 Doubt 1. Is it necessary to require a valuation for the tradition of both kinds, namely wine and the hostia? §51 Dub. 2. Is it ordered correctly who touches the hostia and not the paten? §52 Dub. 3. Whether one who touches the chalice and the paten, but not the hostia, is validly ordained? §53 Dub. 4. Whether he who touches merely the chalice, but not the paten, incurs irregularity? §54 Clericus exercens manus Ordinis majoris, quem non habet, incurrit irregularitatem.

What if it is a Layman? (Remiss. ad n. 116. §55 De Ordinatione Episcoporum. And whether three bishops are required ad valorem. §56 Whether a bishop can confer the First Tonsure outside his Diocese? §57 What is to be done in doubt, whether the Order has been conferred? §58 How are deficiencies in commissioned Ordination to be supplied? §59 And whether time prescribed can be supplanted for Ordinations? §60 By what bishop can Ordination be given? (See the presumed infra under this n. 769.) §61 Who is the minister of Ordinatio? §62 Q. 1. Can any Priest be a minister of ordination by concession of the Pope? Is there a presumption for conferring the Presbyternate? And further, by what concession can any priest confer the Diaconate and Subdiaconate? §63 Qu. 2.

Can abbots confer tonsure and orders, or grant minor distinctions and dissolutions of oblates under those who are not religious? §64 Doubt 1. Can they confer orders upon their own novices? Chap. II. Dub. I.

On the Sacrament II. Does an Abbate ordaining non-subjects validly ordain them? 767 Does one who confers minor orders in a state of mortal sin seriously offend? 768 From which Bishop Regulars should be ordained? 769 Ordination should be done by the proper Bishop, otherwise, etc. 770 Many notes from Butla Speculatores. 771 What if someone has origin in one Diocese, domicile elsewhere, and benefice elsewhere? 772 What if someone happens to be born somewhere by chance? 773 What if someone has different domiciles? 774 How can one be ordained by a Bishop of a Benefice? 775 Dub. 1. Whether an Bishop of a Benefice can dispense in exemptions. 776 Dub. 2. May a Bishop ordain him to whom he confers a Benefice, that he may be able to ordain him? 777 What if someone holds Benefices in different Dioceses? And whether students conclude residence agreements? What is required that someone be ordained by reason of residence? Whether barons and their sons rejoice in the residence of fiefs?

Does an Official have a domicile at the place where he resides? How can anyone be ordained on account of familiarity? And whether servants of servants can be ordained by this title? « Resp. 1. An order is a sacrament by which the preparation for the rightly administered Eucharist is

transmitted. Orders altogether are seven: Ostiarius, Lector, Exorcist, Acolytus, Subdeacon, Deacon, and Priesthood. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted from an ordinary election, not from an extraordinary one. Again, this is doubly so.

"less, and greater, or Bishopric." Whereupon some count «eight». The true tonsure, however, is not an order, except broadly speaking, but merely a disposition to orders, through which one becomes a cleric and capable of ecclesiastical benefices and clerical privileges. * (Ità S. Th. » supplemented question 40 article 2 on Orders tractate 8 chapter 1 note 26 with Soto, and notes 18 and 1 with Vasquez. First true tonsure is not an order, except broadly, but merely a disposition to orders, by which one becomes clerical and capable of ecclesiastical benefices and clerical privileges.

Reg. et aliis (contra Ratio quia 2 loquens de Tensura ait: Ut qui jam §16 Lib. tonsura insigniti essent. VI. Treatise. V. From the Treatise on the Last Things and the Order.

"through lesser things to greater things they ascend." Therefore Tonsu- » does not enumerate among Orders a branch. Besides the Council sessio 23 caput 17 attests these alone to have been Orders in the Church from the beginning, namely from Deaconate to Presbyterate.* From these three are reckoned later as greater, or sacred, on account of the appended vow of solemn chastity, (although ordained through a grave fear, or over-excessive blessing, and by the probability of parents he is not thereto held, unless he has spontaneously ratified it. . 1. 10 c. 4 q. 3. Good. Of the remaining minors, whom with Vasq.

» Others deny that it is a Sacrament, others affirm it to be so more commonly and more probably. And indeed one [thing], either in perfection and end; or in unity of attribution. See Phil. tr. g d. 1. Bon. d. 8 q. 1. If a confessor is elected for a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium, as being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, allows such confirmation after the time of the supplement.

The Order is a Sacrament, it is defined in the Council. Can. 3. ubi: Si quis dixerit Ordinem, sive sacram Ordinationem, non esse vere et propriè Sacramentum à Christo Domino institutum... anathema sit. §5. Quesitum

est: quid sit ordinatio, et quid ordo? Ordinatio est actio illa, per quam sacra potestas tribuitur; Ordo autem melius definitur cum S. Thoma. It is a certain seal of the Church by which spiritual power is conferred upon the one ordained (and commonly add the Doctors do), in relation to the Eucharist.

Ordinatio autem est Sacramentum; Ordo vero effectus Sacramenti. Dicitur autem Ordo ab effectu, quem causat; nam Ordo constituit ministros, qui habent duplicem peculiarem potestatem: unam ad conficiendum Eucharistiam de parte Ordinis ergà corpus Christi reale simul et mysticum; alteram ad absolvendos à peccatis Jurisdictonis ergà corpus Christi mysticum tantùm. It is rightly added in relation to the Eucharist, because all other ministries are communicated for no other purpose than to dispose the faithful, that they may receive the Eucharist worthily. It is evident that the Order truly and properly is a Sacrament, because three of those things which constitute Sacraments are found in it; namely, the External Sign, from Acts 6:6. And praying, they laid on them hands. 2. Promise of grace to ministry, while it is held.

Tim. 4 v. 14. Do not neglect the grace which has been given to you... with the imposition of hands of the Presbyter. 3. The institution of Christ the Lord is had from the same [texts] 11 and 12. And Himself He gave some to Apostles... others to Pastors, and Doctors for the work of the ministry. And from the Gospel according to Saint John 22. Do this in my commemoration.

ubi tantum licet Sacerdotium ordinatum fuerit, tamen contenta eminenter fuit Ordinatio aliorum ministrorum; qui Sacerdotibus in- serviunt. The effects of this Sacrament are. 1. Gratia sanctificans. 2. The sacramental grace for the ministry to be exercised ritually. 3. impressio characteris.

It is faith that within the Church there are to be more Orders; let anathema fall upon him who shall say beyond the Priesthood not to be in the Catholic Church other Orders, both greater and lesser, by whom as it were certain steps toward the Priesthood may be traced. Each Order is defined thusly; and I. ostiariatus est: ordo quo confertur alicui specialis potestas aperiendi et claudendi januam ecclesiæ ac admittendi dignos excluden dique indignos. II. Lectoratus est Ordo, quo confertur alicui specialis potestas legendi Psalmos, et Lec- tiones ex pulpito in Ecclesia, ac populum catechizandi seu instruendi in rebus fidei.

III. The order of exorcism is conferred upon someone with special power to drive out demons. IV. It is conferred upon an Acolyte, by this Order, a

special power to assist at the Solemn Mass as Subdeacon, namely, in lighting the candles, preparing, and offering him ampullae of wine and water. V.

Deaconus est Ordo, quo confertur alicui specialis potestas in Missa solemni inserviendi Diacono, et solemniter canendi Epistolam. VI. Diaconatus est Ordo, quo confertur alicui specialis potestas in Missa solemni immediata assistendi presbytero, et solemniter canendi Evangelium. VII. Presbyteratus, sive Sacerdotium est Ordo, quo confertur aliqui specialis potestas consecrandi corpus et sanguinem a18 Lib.

VI. Treatise. V. Of the Last Unction and Order. Of Christ, also concerning the work and doctrine in absolving from sins and feeding the subjects.

VIII. Episcopatus est Ordo, quo confertur aliquo spectali potestate, qua confirmandi fideles et ordinationis ministros Sacramentorum pertinentibus sunt (subministrando latius, idest non solum pro his qui Sacramenta conferunt, sed praesumptivius pro his qui ex officio ministrant), necnon consecrandi rebus ad divinum cultum pertinentibus. The first tonsure is a solemn ecclesiastical rite consisting in a slight shaving of the hair with certain words, performed by an eligible minister blessed for the occasion, instituted by the Church to signify that a male baptized from the state of infancy is transferred into the order of clerics. The question however arises whether each of the seven orders is a sacrament? Four are the sentiments. The first opinion universally affirms, and this D. 1 et art. 3, which follow, teach. I. 7 c. 1 dub. 7 et 8.

Bellarm. de Gonet. d. 2 art. 1 et Gran. Read and also to many others. The second opinion stated: it is the priesthood alone that constitutes the sacrament, and thus they maintain. III. Verè sententia dict, esse Sacramenta tantùm tres Ordines majores; ità dicit nuper 13 atque putat probabilem . 1. 7 d. 31 n. 27. IV. Finally, the opinion is held, that only the Presbyterate and the Diaconate are Sacraments; and this Tournely holds in t. 10 p. 248.

Cabassut. T. J. 1. 3 c. 16 n. 3 et Habert. to. 7. p. 166 R. 3 cum Gratian. About the sentences of Circarius, I will bring forth my judgment. Sentence: It is a probable opinion. Reason, because Eugenius IV in the Decree ad Armenos states that if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition concerning not electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict to be understood regarding ordinary and not extraordinary election, affords material for the Sacrament of Orders; and

then he explains that the cup with wine and the paten with hostia are matter of the Priesthood, the lectionary book of the Diaconate, a cup empty with an empty paten for Subdiaconate, and other things assigned to the remaining four orders.

By this Decree, when the aforementioned Pontiff declares that all Orders beyond the sacred ones possess their own proper matter for the Sacrament, consequently he declares that all other Orders are Sacraments. It does not hinder, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, that he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to an ordinary election, but not in regard to an extraordinary one. For it is said that the minister of ordination is only the Bishop, as it is stated in Nam respondetur; if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to an ordinary election, but not in regard to an extraordinary one. For it is said that the minister of ordination is only the Bishop, as it is stated in Nam respondetur. This must be understood of an ordinary minister, not however of an extraordinary one whom the Pope can well appoint for conferring such orders, as they say. The one who explicitly teaches this in the supplement, question 38, article 1, ad 3. And in fact it is held from the same [source] 763. The sentence II which states that solely the priesthood is a Sacrament, seems to me and to others sufficiently probable: namely from what I shall say shortly, speaking about the fourth sentence.

Sententia III. pariter ac prima est probabilis. But the fourth sentiment is more probable to me, which teaches that only priesthood and deaconship are sacraments, not however other orders. First part: If a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict to be understood regarding ordinary rather than extraordinary election, confirms that not only Priesthood but also Diaconate is a Sacrament, since in the ordination of Deacon three things concur as we said are sufficient for a Sacrament, namely i. Signum sensibile, scilicet impositio manuum. Divine institution, for the Council.

Trident. defined: Si quis dixerit in Ecclesia Catholica non esse Hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quae constat ex Episcopis, Presbyteris, et ministris, anathema sit. By all ministers, even deacons, are understood to be instituted by divine ordination. 3. The promise of grace concurs, which

the words of the bishops signify. Receive the Holy Spirit to strength, etc. Which words have the reason of a form, and truly produce grace, as wrote Pope Anastasius II in c. 7 ap. Cabassut. 1. c. as it is clearly affirmed in the session twenty-third of Trent.

Can. 4 ubi habetur: Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinatorem non dari spiritum 25o lib. IV. Treatise. V. Of the Extreme Unction and Order.

Holy, and therefore in vain, to say to Bishops: Receive the Holy Spirit... Anathema be upon it. Therefore, when in the Ordination of a Deacon the Bishop already says, "Accipies Spiritum Sanctum," etc., the true Spirit of Sanctity is indeed given, and consequently the Sacrament is conferred. The other part indeed, namely if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received for ordinary election and not extraordinary, has been approved, that other minor Orders and Subdiaconate are not Sacraments, since there lacks matter and form of Ordinal Sacrament; indeed, lack of matter is because there is no imposition of hands, which alone is the matter of this Sacrament: according to the more probable opinion, rather than the slender one from Qu. III. There is lacking the presumed form of the Sacrament; for in the conferral of these Orders, there is no form present that expresses the production of grace, but rather only mention is made of the power which is transmitted.

It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For no one from among the seven Ordinates can undergo a repetition; hence in each [Ordination] the character is impressed, which cannot be impressed otherwise than by the Sacrament. For it is replied that neither the consecrations of churches are repeated, nor therefore do they imprint a character, nor are they sacraments. It does not hinder if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not supplementary, which is that, if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not supplementary. Clemens. l. 8. Constit. c. 21 dice in Ordinatione Subdiaconorum hanc fieri

Orationem: Tribue eis, Domine, Spiritum Sanctum, ut digne vasa Domini attrectare valeant.

For it is answered: It is questioned thereafter whether the Episcopate be a distinct order from the Priesthood. They deny St. Thomas. S. Bonav. et alii, qui dicunt, esse extensionem Ordinis Presbyteratus. But they commonly affirm this also because the Order of Episcopate is conferred by manual imposition of hands and through form, with the Archpriest consecrating by the Holy Spirit, etc. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict, is understood in reference to ordinary election, not to extraordinary one. For, if the Episcopate were distinct from Order, a Bishop could validly at least ordain even though he were not a Priest; for it is answered that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict, is understood in reference to ordinary election, not to extraordinary one. For this congruent with divine ordination requires that whoever wishes to be confirmed or ordained must have been baptized. « Resp. 2. The remote matter of ordinations is something, 39 an instrument handed down to be given as a sign of spiritual power; the proximate is its delivery and acceptance, whose physical contact and immediate connection, although not essential, are probingly taught with Sa, Henr.

Reg. . 4 de Sacram. n. 185 et aliis, quos citat: contrarium tamen communius est, ac tutius, ut altera saltèm manu tangatur; imò ex præcepto ad scrupulum vitandum, utraque manu; et quidem omnia; v. gr. The chalice with the paten, this with the hostia, as Filolet teaches. And likewise at the same time with the pronouncement of the Bishop's words; see § 5 to § 9 ch. 5. Bonac. d. 8 p. 1 punct. 3. V. 1 R. 40 et 42.

This is doubted: whether the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders were determined by Christ the Lord in a specific manner? See what is said about Harebert, Conchius, Thomas. It is doubted. Whether a Latin cleric was validly ordained by the 74th material text assigned to the Greeks, namely by mere manual imposition of hands, and conversely? They affirm at Crox, lib. 6, p. 1, n. 16. v.

Ins. quia, dum Ecclēsia unica est, necessaria quoque uniformitas sacramentorum esse debet. But Croix himself, together with Arrigha and others, denies this, who from the determination of the Church attribute no signification to the matter assigned to the Greeks, namely that if a

Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. This means that the matter assigned to the Latins has no signification in this regard. Both are probable, but the former is more probable according to our judgment drawn from no. 12 on Sacraments in general, where we said that the imposition of hands alone, which is found in lib. 25. VI. Treatise.

V. In respect to both its matter and form, the institution and order are common to both Greeks and Latins as essential material for the Sacrament of Orders; whereas the tradition of instruments is merely integral material. If however a Latin ordination is conferred in a Greek form, or conversely, without doubt it is a valid ordination, as rightly and commonly Lugo says, d. 2, nu. 107. Cajetan. and Dicast. 742 Dub. 3. Whether, attesting to the probable opinion of those who say that for validity of Ordination the tradition of the instruments is required according to their value, an absolutely presumptuous requirement is made of the contact on the part of the recipient?

The first opinion negates and maintains this, Cajet. in the Summa I. Of those ordaining, Fourth Reply, page 185, likewise Albert. Mag. p. 4 n. 21. Reason, because for the concession of powers and dominions of things it suffices that a minister, or a master gives them over, and another present receives them without contact with the thing given. The second opinion asserts, and this is held by D. 1. 7 cap. i dub. 2.

Yes, from Con. Reason, because Christ instituted the Ordainment to be conferred, as Church practice suggests, and in accordance with the form of words which say: "that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the period of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; hence this matter pertains to the essence of the Sacred Sacrament." And this opinion, since it is sufficiently probable, must altogether be followed in practice, at least in the Orders of priesthood and diaconate; for as regards other Orders, it is probable that they are not Sacraments, as we have said in n. 737. 743 Dub. 4. An ad valorem Ordinationis requiratur contactus physicus instrumentorum? Others deny it, whose opinion they rightly deem probable, 125 q. 5 R. 3.

Reason, because speaking humbly, this very thing, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, can be adequately confirmed by another triennium

after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, is accepted if someone offers something to another and the other signifies acceptance of it by some sensible sign, even though there may be no contact. They indeed affirm with the more common judgment cc. . 7 art..... . 18. c. 2 n. 14 with Soto Aversa, et. You will say: Infants cannot touch matter with voluntary contact of the tongue, yet, if ordered, they are validly ordained, as we said in no. 782. But it is replied that if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he may well be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, for which reason, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he may well be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary and not of extraordinary election. Moreover, little ones cannot have recourse to presumptuous moral contact; hence rightly it is said that they are validly ordained only insofar as their ordination is voluntary with the will of the Church, and their cleansing in Baptism corresponds to them. And since this judgment is presumptuously probable, the aforementioned Doctors rightly say that it must absolutely be held in practice.

But rightly said "Et" likewise with common consent they also rightly say the same Escob. I cite and Croix number 2157 with Gob., et qui enim sic tangit, truly said to touch all senses truly. However, it must be noted here. If a confessor is chosen for supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones, which requires that matters be delivered to the same bishop who offers the form: since such is the usage of the Church, so Christ is deemed to have instituted. q. 38 art. 1 ad 2. l. 7 o. 5 dub. 5 et Secus vero esse docet D. Notandum II. if a confessor is chosen for supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones., if ordinations are conferred by the bishop, even though another celebrates Mass for him, the future ordination will be valid but illicit, which was declared by S. C. and confirmed by Innocentius XIII in a congregation held on 5 February, year 1722. Thus it refers N. P. "Resp. 3.

The ostiary is ordained by tradition of the keys 753 of the Church, the lector by the books of readings 754, the exorcist by the books of exorcisms, the acolyte by the vials of incense 354, Lib. VI. Tract. V. Of Extreme Unction and Order.

either indeed one, or at least a candlestick with the wax extinguished – because it is for him to prepare the light, the wine, and the water for the Mass: (But now concerning the materials of the acolythes, whether the tradition of the censers or the candlesticks? Resp. esse utrumque, cum S. Thomae et Bonaventurae. With regard to this, the subdeacon traditionally receives the chalice with a paten laid over it vacantly, because it is his task to prepare these things for Mass: “The deacon, through imposition of hands, and by tradition of the book of the Gospels, since it is his duty to minister at the altar, as stated in the Pontifical—catechize, chant the Gospel, and with the faculty of the parish priest preach, baptize, and administer the Eucharist: (Nevertheless, in necessity, according to what has been said, n. 116.)” Certainly, and n. 237. What.) The priest, with the tradition of the chalice filled with wine and the paten placed upon it, added to this form is given the power to offer a sacrifice; then by imposition of hands, with another added form, he is given the power to forgive sins to others.

See 187 and 188 and p. 8 loc. cit. Quaer. I. What, however, is the matter and the form of subdiaconate? Among the Greeks there is imposition of hands; among the Latins it is doubted whether it is a chalice with a paten or a Book of Letters? Others say that the proximate material should be solely the tradition of the empty cup with the patena, from the Council; if a Confessor is appointed for the supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not appointing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary.

You may please God. Others, however, say that the tradition of the book of Epistles would likewise be essentially material, as Escobard states in lib. 23 n. 170 and the Ratio, because it is still a special matter for Subdeacons solemnly to read Epistles. They nevertheless deny this, Habert says, and [he says], and . Reason, because no judgment perceives the Church instituting such a rite as necessary material for this Order; for they say that through the tradition of the chalice and paten the ministerial function sufficiently signified for the Subdiacon to minister bread and wine offered, so that he may offer it to the Priest. Nevertheless, his objections notwithstanding, I hold with Croix n. 2149 that in practice the opinion prevails, namely, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it may well be

confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood odiously and strictly with respect to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Likewise, both the tradition of the chalice and the tradition of the Book of Epistles are proximate matters of subdiaconate, following what might reasonably be deemed not improbable.

There is doubt whether the chalice and paten should be consecrated in the Ordination of a Sub-749 deacon. There is no doubt from necessity of the precept, but they deny it; from necessity of the Sacrament to the value, but it must be affirmed with ..Sylv. and therefore ought properly to be ecclesiastical or sacred, in distinction from the priest initiating, whose ministry, since it does not concern vessels, does not require that the vessels be consecrated, as they hold when regarding the dicastery. And this is stated morally certainly. But this likewise is contradicted by no. 2150: for according to these words it follows that the office of a Subdeacon is to hand over to the Deacon the chalice and the paten; also to present bread and wine as offerings of the people; then to chant solemnly, and even to carry the cross in processions. Et autem peccant graviter subdiaconi et diaconi solemniter ministrantes in mortale?

Probabiliter negatur cum Vall. 3 n. 24 contra alios quia neque sacramentum conficiunt neque operas efficiunt quae ex opere operato conferre gratiam cui ipsi objicium per peccatum ponant; tamen saltèm venialiter peccabunt. See regarding this point what has been more extensively said in Question NoneII. What is the matter and form of a Diaconus? The first opinion states that it is only the tradition of the Form of the Evangelistries: Receive the Spirit according to this form.

VI. Treatise. V. On Extreme Unction, and also on Vasaque. Gloves.

Reg. . according to Escobar 1:23 n. 165. And this judgment seems to be explicitly expressed in question 37, article 5, ad 5, where it says: In the very act of giving, a character is impressed. Reason, because at the Council of Florence alone is the tradition of the Book of the Gospels assigned as the matter of diaconate. And although the imposition of hands is necessary ex praecepto Ecclesiae, nevertheless it is not essential, since it is merely a rite introduced by the Church herself, whether by the Apostles or otherwise, as Gregory IX says in cap. Presbyter de Sacram. non iterand., where he states thus: When priests and deacons are ordained, they receive the imposition of hands tactually (a rite introduced by the Apostles), according to the practice of the Church. The second opinion holds that there is solely the imposition of hands; and this is maintained by Juvenin, t. 7, p. 589, Merb., p. 293, q. 48.

Tournely t. 10 pag. 247 Habert c. 7 q. 5 cum Morino, et Becano, item Scotus. S. apud Escob. n 16°. Probatur i ex Act. 6, ubi cum sermo habeatur de Ordinatione prioris Diaconorum, tantùm impositionis manuum fit mentio: Orantes imposuerunt eis manus. It is confirmed from the Council of Carthage. IV. Can. 5 ubi dicitur: Cum Diaconus ordinatur, solus Episcopus manus super caput ejus ponet.

Probatum est secundum ritu tertium. The Greek Church, in which Deacons are ordained solely through the imposition of hands. Fourth point is demonstrated by reason, because it is the matter of the sacrament in whose application the Holy Spirit is bestowed, namely the grace of the Sacrament; for when the Spirit of Sanctity is conferred on a Deacon through imposition of hands, as is evident from the form: Accipe Spiritum sanctum ad robur, etc., hence alone the imposition of hands is the essential matter of Diaconate. And if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the period of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, like an odious and strict rule for ordinary choice, not for extraordinary, as stated verbatim: Accipe Spiritum sanctum, etc., which clearly (as we said) was decreed at Trent, session 23, canon 4: If anyone shall say that the Holy Spirit is not given through the sacrament of Ordination, and consequently falsely say to Bishops: Accipe Spiritum sanctum... let him be anathema. Neither does it hinder the text opposed in that chapter concerning the Presbyters; for (as Bellarmine responds in On Orders, chap. g) such imposition of hands is said to have been introduced by the Apostles, not because they themselves instituted it, but because they executed it first after accepting it from the Lord. The third opinion states that both (namely tradition and imposition of hands) are essential matters; thus Bellarm. d. c. g.

Lugo de Sacram d. 2 n. 10. 228 qu. 4 cum n. 167. cum Con. Soto, and Led. Reason, because the Church, by virtue of the power entrusted to her by Christ, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict and should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, that which is, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict and should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Greeks determined that the essential matter of Diaconate is solely the imposition of hands; and if a Confessarius is elected for supplementation, it can be

well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessarius beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in ordinary election but not in extraordinary, which if a Confessarius is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessarius beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in ordinary election but not in extraordinary. But Latins, besides [the imposition], have tradition of the Book.

Having stated these premises, I say that the first opinion is probable, the second more probable, and the third still probable; and hence altogether to be followed in practice according as it pertains to the value of the Sacrament. Questio. III. What is the matter and form of Presbytratus? There are equally three opinions.

The first opinion, which Fagnanus holds in chapter Presbyter of Sacraments regarding non-iteration. Soto in IV d. 24, q. 1, art. 1 item Ang. et Non- nus apud dictam materiam esse solam traditionem instrumentorum, et formam, verba illa, quæ profert episcopus in traditione instrumentorum, nam: Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium Deo, Missasque celebrandi tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini. And with this alone as matter and form they say that power to sacrifice is to be delivered, namely, to absolve from sins. They prove from the Decretals of Eugenius IV to the Armenians (reported at the Cross no. 2128), where it is said: The priesthood is transmitted through the presentation of the chalice with wine and the paten with bread. But this opinion has not been generally accepted by the Fathers.

See how the Decree of Eugene is to be understood; this will be explained below. The second opinion, which Estius holds in his Fourth Decretum, twenty-fourth question, section twenty-four, with Scotus, Conner, Henry, and canon number thirty-nine with Vasquez. Sixth, s58 Chapter. Sixth. Tract.

V. Regarding the Extreme Unction, and the imposition of hands, wherein is conveyed the power over the mystical body of Christ, namely, absolution from sins, with the form: Receive the Holy Spirit, whose sins are remitted to them. If any confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strictly to be accepted in ordinary election, not extraordinary, requires the tradition of instruments with the form: Accipe potestatem etc., which is proven from the Decree of Eugene above

mentioned, and from D. 5 where it states: In the very giving of the chalice under the determined form of words, the sacerdotal character is impressed. If a confessory is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strictly to be received in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary one, requires the presumption of imposition of hands; this is proven from Sacred Scripture, Acts 13. 3 where it is said that Paul and Barnabas were ordained priests by the imposition of hands: Then fasting, and praying, they laid their hands on them and sent them away. And si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. forma hujus impositionis manus sint verba, Accipe Spiritum sanctum etc. probatur ex eodem 4, ubi declaratur, per sacram Ordinationem dare Spiritum sanctum, nec frustra Episcopum dicere: Accipe Spiritum sanctum.

Wherefore, when in the imposition of hands it is said by the Bishop: Accipe Spiritum sanctum etc., then the Sacrament is perfected, and its grace is conferred. The third more probable opinion, which Juvenal T. 7 holds on page 589. Concina tomo 10 pagina 31 nota 4. Petrocor. t. 4 p. 232 cum S. Bonav. et 10 pag. 218 cum Martene, Becano, Menardo, etc., dicta est utramque potestatem Sacerdoti sacrificandi et absolvendi per solam secundam manuum impositionem. It is said to be the second one, for in the Ordination of a Presbyter, the Bishop extends his hands three times: First, when he extends his hand without saying anything; Second, when together with the Priests he extends his hand upon candidates and pronounces prayers; Third, when after Communion he says: Receive the Holy Spirit, etc. They therefore say that both powers are given in the second instance, neither in the first (which is certain for all), nor in the third; for the third already presupposes consecrated Priests, since they themselves with the Bishop are already consecrating the Eucharist; but in the second instance, when the Bishop extends his hands together with the Presbyters, as is evident from the session of Trent, chapter 3, where it states: Ministers of the altar.

Unction are either from bishops or priests ordained themselves through the imposition (note) of the hands of the presbyters, that is, which takes place when the bishop extends his hands assisted by the presbyters. This opinion

is confirmed from Sacred Imposition, as above, where mention is made of the consecration solely through the imposition of hands. But the Tridentine session 23, chapter 2 states: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary. This is taught by the Sacred Letters with very serious words regarding what must chiefly be attended to in the ordination of Deacons and Priests; therefore, if the Sacred Letters speak only about the imposition of hands, we must say: besides the imposition of hands, nothing else is essentially necessary in ordination. And this is denoted most by that word: while other things are merely required as integral parts, namely, for a clearer declaration of the accepted power. Proof is given 2. Because the Greeks are ordained solely by the imposition of hands: therefore, if the ordination of the Greeks is valid solely through the imposition of hands; thus, it should be presumptuously held valid that the ordination of the Latins is so, since the whole validity of the Sacraments depends upon their matter and the form of institution instituted by Christ the Lord, who (as is evident from Scripture) established the imposition of hands for the matter of ordination.

An addition to this is made if a Confessor be chosen as an补充已被翻译，以下是剩余部分的翻译： <|im_start|>⚗□ fkk fkk fkk

drawn forth by Nec obstat, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Eugen. IV. ut supra assignaverit pro materia traditionem Presbyteratus instrumentorum cum forma: accipe potentiam eiciens. For the same Pope wisely responds thus. XIV. t. c. p. 251 cum Morino, Becano, et Menardo, Eugenium tamùm ibi locutum fuisse de materia et forma integrale, quam intendit tradere Armenis, qui optabant aggregari Ecclesiæ Latinae; ct ideò non fuit opus eis assignare impositionem manuum, cum illi juxta ritum Graecorum, quem priùs habebant ordinationis, jam adhabebant. Wherefore we did not Eugenius change the matter and form of this Sacrament, but merely added to the tradition of the instruments of imposition of hands as a part integral, as we have said.

But according to this third opinion, which seems more probable to me on intrinsic grounds (though speaking philosophically), those authors differ in assigning the form of the Presbyterate to the aforementioned proposition; for some, like Petrocorensis (to whom Lugo agrees in part concerning the Sacrament), They (Dub. 2 n. 99) say that the words which are pronounced in the tradition of the chalice and paten are: "Accipe potestatem," etc., because (as they say), a moral connection remains between the imposition and the aforementioned form in the tradition of instruments. However, Morinns et Tournely perhaps more probabily say that the form is an oration which is said by the Bishop in the very imposition; but as for the words, Accipe Spiritum sanctum, etc., which are pronounced in the third imposition, they say that these are only declarative and confirmative of the thing accomplished, namely, the gift of the Holy Spirit already conferred in the second imposition. I said, speaking speculatively, that this opinion is more probable; for although the second proposition is presumptively probable, this must nonetheless be followed in practice. Therefore rightly observed Croix n. 1245, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can indeed be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, which prohibits the choice of a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Ordination made without the whole imposition of the second manual should be entirely repeated, as the Sacred Congregation declared among the Benedictines. XIV. t. c. p. 254. Reason, because he who has not received power over the true Body of Christ cannot either presumptuously receive the power over the mystical Body of Christ. If however the Ordination was performed without the imposition of three hands, this alone must be supplied. But here, given the aforementioned proposition to be held in practice, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. The tradition of instruments being presumed essential material of this Sacrament is doubted. 1.

Whether it is necessary to the Sacrament that the supposed both species be handed over together with the chalice and paten, namely bread and wine? They deny that it is probable. 7 cap. 3 d. 12 n. 17 item Fiil. c. 3 n. 45 et dicunt, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., licet ex praecepto utraque species tradenda sit, tamen sufficiat ad valorem Sacramenti, ut una sola conferatur. They, however, assert more probingly and Sporer (§ 306), hence it cannot be delivered except to an intact Sacrifice to be offered, follows that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if to consecrate to both species is not given, no consecration will be given to any [species]. And since this judgment is probable, yea more probable, it must be entirely followed in practice, as rightly stated by Croix n. 2151. Dubium 2.

Would it be validly ordered to touch these, and not the door? Sporer commonly affirms n. 23. . 7 c. 5§. 2 n. 5., and Schilder according to Croix n. 2153., they nearly hold as certain. Reason, because the hostia and wine are the substantial matter of the priesthood, by which principally is signified the power in the body of Christ, and on account of mere decency

is usurped from the precept of the Church 262 Lib. VI. Treatise.

V. Concerning the Extremes—Union, and Order. chalice, and paten. And consequently they also say, Sporer and co., if the chalice with wine and this hostia is handed over mixed in or imposed without a paten. This opinion truly seems to be very probable. But La Croix I. c. refers, two doctors consulted of their own accord to judge such an Ordination as doubtful; and the same seems to have been the sense of Bussæus tom I. v.

The Order n. 2 and Etenim in the Decree of Eugene assigns as material for the priesthood the chalice with wine, and the paten with hostia. And in the Pontifical it is said: And the cup of the chalice, and the paten of the hostia are united. Wherefore La Croix ibid. (to whom I adhere). Question 2) Non immerito dictum consultum esse, ut talis ordinatio repetatur sub conditione; quamvis enim prima sententia fere certa videatur, tamen Lugo Respons. mor., lib. I, dub. I loquendo de Sacramento Baptismi, sit ait: "Læce sententia negans valorem Sacramenti non aestimetur probabilis, nihilominus foret sufficiens motivum reiterandi, quia prudenter formidare possumus, ne forte sit probabile, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. sit invalidum aut saltem ne accedente judicio plurium DD. id successu temporis fiat probabile." And in the same dubium tractans de Sacramento Ordinis, idem ait: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Esto quis quiescere posset in prima Ordinatione propter aliquam sententiam aesti- matam moraliter certam; tamen non sit peccaturus, si stante sententiä opposita aliorum pro nullitate Sacra- menti, ad majorem animi quietem iterum sub conditione ordinetur. Si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Praesumptum Episcopus licite in gratiam ejus poterit facere. And the reason seems to be, because the very anxiety regarding the doubt, if it is intense and just, is a valid cause for ordination under the condition of repeating it.

And the same is felt by Croix n. 2145 with Gobatum, who says, that Baptismal Sacrament can be iterated on account of a doubt not openly vain. Dubit 3. Is a priest validly ordained who merely touches the chalice and paten, and does not touch the host? The first opinion denies this, and that is held by Habert t. 7 p. 172 qui 4, likewise Baucius, and Villal. according to Escob. n. 188 and 190, likewise Bernal. Faber, et hi dicunt: hoc debeo iterum sub conditione ordinari, ut à dubiis liberetur; et ab hac sententia non dissentiunt Bon. et Bass., allati in Dub. praeced.: dicendo, tutius esse attingere patenam et hostiam, ne Ordinandus periculo se exponat. However, the second opinion is common and more accurate in its affirmation, and this is held by Sauchi.

Concilium Lateranense VII caput i de dubitationibus secunda numerus IX. Wigandt tract. 15 n. 11 et 43. Gonet and Isamb. in. Habert loc. cit. pag. 229. Resolution 88 and etc., and Escob. with Con.

Sporer: : The pontiff hands each one a chalice with wine and a supposita paten with the hostia, and they themselves receive it between the index and middle fingers; and they touch simultaneously both the cup of the chalice and the paten. Then because the wine contained in the cup certainly is not immediately touched; therefore it is not required that the host be immediately touched; hence on these grounds and on account of the common consent of the Doctors, this opinion may be said to be morally certain. Moreover, rightly do they observe that it should be carefully attended to for those being ordained to touch both the chalice and the paten along with the hostia (preferably), in order to free themselves from every scruple: Doubt 4. An order is rightly considered valid who merely immediately touches the chalice but not the paten. The first opinion which Roncaglia holds on page 125 question 5.

R. 3. Cross n. 2154 with nos. 205 and 229, it is said that this ought to be reorganized under a condition, both because in the Pontifical, as aforementioned, the touching of both calix and paten is prescribed, and also because the touching of the paten would rather be moral than physical. The second meaning, however, which is held by the part of Palaus, section 4, note 20. Diana part. 6 tr. 8. R. 19 with Bauni, and l. 7 c. 5 §. 2 n. 6 with Vasquez.

Opposed, and Lib. 264. VI. Treatise. V. On the Extreme Unction and Order.

This is strongly ordained to be, because the cal. X and the patena then morally make one. And hanc sententiam Præpositus et Bosco apud Croix l.c. vocant moraliter certam: ego tamen censeo eam tantùm probabiliorem,

sed primam non improbabilem, et ideò in praxi tenendam: qua- pròpter dico, sub conditione talem Clericum esse reordinandum. 354 Notandum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. carens Ordine Sacerdotii, vel Episcopatbs, invalide exerceret eorum munera. But they who are lacking in other Ordinations, lawfully exercise them if the Ordinations be lesser ones; unlawfully, if the Ordinations be greater ones. Hence gravely sins the cleric, who without Order solemnly exercises the office of Deacon or Subdeacon, and thereby incurs both irregularity and excommunication; but this severe sentence to be inflicted according to c. 1 et 2 de Utrum autem eandem poenam incurrent laicitatilers ministrantes? See what has been said about the Sacrament V.

But dub. 1, where we have maintained a negative judgment. 355 Here some notes must be made concerning the Ordination of a Bishop, and I. The bishop cannot be validly ordained except by another bishop, according to the Apostle to the Hebrews, 7. The major is not blessed from the minorite thus. Chapter 4, note 2. To such an Ordination various things concur, namely the imposition of the Book of Gospels upon the ordinand's shoulders, the unction of the crown of him who is to be ordained, and the imposition of hands by three Bishops: likewise also the tradition of the staff, and the ring, according to Croix n. 2148. Whether however the assistance of three Bishops is demanded for a valid election, it is in a case of necessity; certain it is that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, ought to be understood with reference to an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. This is required by necessity of precept. From 2 c. 7.

It seems certain, from the commission of the Pontiff in a case of necessity, that Ordination may validly be conferred upon the Ordinate by one Bishop; as Croix number 2147 and Avers assert. Thus, commonly do the Apostles be said to have done when ordaining Bishops; and thus many Popes are testified to by Cardinals to have performed it, and many in Croix n. 2147, where is found a presumed decree of the Sacred Congregation declaring such Ordination to be valid. Concerning the sought-after matter, others say that three are absolutely required, and thus they believe according to c. 4 n. 6. Thus wrote Pope Damasus in St. Anthony's cap. 4 n. 8. Reason, because in the Pontifical of Rome only bishops are said to be consecrators, whereas the assistants are present; for in other Sacraments only one minister is required.

And it is confirmed by Canon 1. Among the Apostles according to Clement, where it is said in the Decree of Simon Apostle: If any one shall have been ordained by one Bishop, let him who has been ordained be deposed. If he is to be deposed, therefore he is truly ordained. Both opinions are probable; hence, in practice the first must absolutely be followed, as is evident from Proposition 1, condemned by Innocent. XI.

And the reason is that since the opinion (as we said in n. 738) that the Episcopate is a true distinct Sacrament from the Priesthood is very probable, we are bound to follow the stricter part of its ordination to avoid common harm; otherwise, priests ordained by this Bishop would remain dubiously ordained. It is because it is very probable that the Episcopate is a true distinct Sacrament from the Presbyterate (as we said in n. 738), that we hold it necessary to follow the more particular part in its Ordination to avoid common damage; otherwise, priests ordained by this Bishop would remain dubiously ordained. The Bishop can confer the first tonsure upon his subordinates outside their own diocese; because it is not the custom of the Barbaços. etc. But this is not certain. Therefore, it is asked whether an episcopal corpore can confer tonsure in another diocese without the permission of the bishop of the place? They deny. 1. 7 c. 1 dub. 50 n. 2 with Salzedo and Barbosa in agreement with Garcia, Campanile, Acunna, and others: it has been forbidden for Bishops to exercise Pontificalia in a foreign Diocese without the permission of its Ordinary; and since the first tonsure is an Order, they think that it cannot be conferred without Pontificals.

They indeed affirm with c. 1, n. 48, § 7; another c. 49, n. 4, and ..., etc., ap., Barbos., and Lopez, Barbat., Lib. 266. VI. Treatise. V. Concerning the Extrema Unot., and Order. and Rebuff apud cc. Reason, because, since it is a more common and probable opinion among Theologians that if some Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; since the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary one, if some Confessor be chosen for supplementation, may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary one.

Shaving of the tonsure is not an order; hence it can and usually is conferred privately without pontifical insignia, so that if a confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another

triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium being odious, strict, and to be accepted as regards an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. For this reason, if a confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious, strict, and to be accepted regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; nor does it require the license of the bishop of the place. 57 « 2. When a doubt arises whether an Order has been truly conferred, for instance because the matter was doubtful, it may and should be repeated under the condition that it must. When, however, there is reason such that both probity and validity are equally likely or unlikely, he says in 3 R. 47 ex Gran., it may be iterated under condition; rather should it be, if it is Episcopal or Priestly: for instance. If a Priest or Bishop has not touched holy vessels or that instrument whose presentation is marked with a character, nevertheless he accepts the Deacon who immediately touched the paten but not the host. He, however, who did not touch the censer and the paten while the form was being offered, but rather a short time afterward, is shown by Lugo, Moral. lib. 33, p. 33, to be able indeed to be again ordained under condition for the greater repose of his soul, yet not to be necessary.

However correctly it is noted that even if someone has eaten, it is not thereby rendered invalid his ordination or consecration, nor does it come to be thought that he touched sacred vessels when he did not touch them, nor is it imagined that he did not touch them when in reality he did; hence it is not necessary to go about seeking the Order again on account of mere oblivion or fear, which are insufficient for a prudent and reasonable doubt or probability. It is asked how the defects committed in Ordination should be supplied? To be distinguished: If the defect is concerning the accidents, namely if the imposition of hands by the Presbyter initiating has been lacking, then it should first be supplied by the same Bishop if this can be done; thus Cons. lib. 7 c. 1. dub. 13 n. 4 . 28. Cross n. 2200 and 2201, and Aversa. Otherwise, one thus ordained, if he did not care to have this kind of defect supplanted, or ministered before the suppletion had been received in Ordination, would commit a grievous sin; but he would not incur irregularity, as correctly they advert, because he who ministers in an Order that he does not have is irregular; but here he truly has the Order.

Nam et qui ministraret ante suppletionem, quae fieri deberet, circa aliquod defectum dubie essentialis in ordinationis verbo, incurrit irregularitatem? It seems to be denied; for he who is dually ordained cannot be absolutely said to be unordained. However, here it must be noted that this does not mean, when the defect would be in a minor matter, but only in a grave

one, namely if there were lack of imposition of hands or of consecration words; if the presbyter was to be ordained without extension of his consecration words by the Bishop, yet this is not said. C. n. 5. If someone were chosen as Confessor for the sake of suppletion, he could properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of suppletion, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years, being odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinaria electione rather than extra-ordinaria. If someone were to be chosen as Confessor for the sake of suppletio, he could properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of suppletion, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years being odious and strict should be understood regarding ordinaria electione rather than extra-ordinaria. If the candidate were not to recite the Canon, such ceremony would not need repetition. To be noted with Croix n. 2200 and Aversa: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si defectus fuerit occultus, occulte supplendus sit, ad vitandum scandalum et turbationem aliorum. Si vero deficit est circa essentialia, nempe circa materialem et formalim, tanto magis est supplendus.

But here you will inquire whether the entire Sacrament is then to be supplied? Resp. I. If the Sacrament consists of duplicate matter and form, as in the Ordination of Priesthood according to the probable opinion of many, namely a cup with wine and a paten with hostia, and imposition of hands; then if there is a defect in the anterior part, namely in the transmission of the cup and paten, certainly the entire Sacrament must be repeated. Because the power above the mystical Body of Christ is founded on the power above the real Body of Christ; but otherwise, if there is a defect in the posterior part, because the power towards the true Body of Christ has already been independently transmitted by the subsequent part. Thus and Cross n. 2204. and others similarly throughout.

Resp. Second. If only a part of the matter is lacking or there is doubt whether it has been omitted, in the ordination of priests and bishops, the entire Sacrament must be repeated; hence, if the paten with hostia and the chalice without wine have been handed over, the whole ordination should be repeated, handing over both materials, as they say. 28. et Croix n. 2005. cum Aversa, et aliis pluribus; thus altogether to be held according to

said n. 750. They say however . 268 Lib. VI.

Treatise. V. Concerning the Extreme Unction, and this must be held in the ordination of priests and bishops, but not in the ordination of other orders; for in them, if there is a probability regarding the value of the received ordination, it does not require that defects be made good by subsequently receiving the priesthood; all the power of those [ordained] shall then be accepted in the priesthood. But it must not be admitted even for the Order of Diaconate; for in the chapter "Presbyter," speaking on Sacred Canons about the ordination of deacons, the Pontiff says that if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the imposition of hands has been omitted, it must certainly be repeated; even if it seems probable, only tradition of the Book exists on this regarding essence. But such defects, whether essential or accidental, should be supplied at a designated time for the conferral of Orders. They commonly affirm, however, Croix n. 2200 et c. n. 7. cum Junta.

Panorm. and Presbyter, ubi cum fiat sermo de impositione manus in Ordinatione Presbyteri vel Diaconi, sic dicitur: Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Si omissum fuerit, non est aliquatenùs iterandum sed statuto tempore ad hujusmodi Ordines conferendos cautè supplendum si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Per errorem extitit prætermissum. It seems to me that this distinction should be made: If the defect is concerning the value of the Sacrament, then it must be supplemented by the Church at a time prescribed, as the second opinion holds; and this does not seem to be capable of denial from the text alluded to shortly. Second, however, it must be said if there were an accidental defect. Certainly, here is the literal English translation of the target sentence:

"Probabiliter tamen dict. 7. c. 5 § 2 n. 13 cum Gran. et Quintanad. et Croix d. n. 2200 cum Aversa; et Gob. et aliis universim ut asserit, si quis

Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per alium triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si ob solum dubium iteretur Ordo sub conditione vel caeremonia aliqua. poterit iterari quovis die et à quovis Episcopo; eodemque die poterunt simul conferri Ordines tām majores quam minores adhibitis solis solemnitatibus probabiliter necessariis ad valorem." The Bishop cannot ordain except subjects, or by reason of origin (if indeed they be born within his jurisdiction), or by reason of domicile, by the will of perpetual residence therein, or by reason of a benefice existing in his diocese. 8. . etc. commun. * (Vol, adde, by reason of family ties or servitude, but from Ordinaries no subject is suspended for a year from the collation of ordinations without the license of his Ordinary, as it is found in c. Nullus, and cap. Eos qui, de ut habetur in c. Cum nullus, de tempore ordin. in 6 et ex commun., Henriq. . 2 cap. 34 d. 19. It must however be noted I. according to Can. 7 76 it is definitively stated that bishops alone are ordinary ministers of the Sacrament of Orders: while a bishop may by election and confirmation give permission to his subjects for ordination by another bishop, he may not ordain unless it is presumed that he has been consecrated; moreover, even if a consecrated bishop should be degraded or have renounced his episcopate, he can validly ordain. This is common with q. 3 ar. 2. 14 et 15. But more things are to be discussed. Question None

Whether a pontiff can give to a simple sacristan the faculty of conferring orders? Distinguish: if a Confessor shall be chosen as a supplement, he can advantageously be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not for extraordinary election. For if a Confessor shall be chosen as a supplement, he can advantageously be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not for extraordinary election. Tonsura, et Ordines minores à quolibet Sacerdote conferri possint ex commissione Pontificis, est communis cum S. Th. Soto. Thus S. Th. d. q. 38 ar. I and Palaus, Aversa, Num, and Granad. with against with Innoc.

IV. Vasq. et probant ex Conci- lio Nec Presbyterum verò, neque Diaconum audeant ordinare, præter conscientiam Episcopi, idest, ipsa ig- 27o Lib. VI. Treatise. V.

From the Tract and Order, neither knowing nor consenting, therefore they

could themselves know and consent. They say, however, that Chorepiscops are simple priests, in which Morinus and Thomassinus agree; yet they were really bishops, but suffragan ones, who could not ordain without the consent of the bishop of the city; and they support this from the same Council of Antioch, d. Can. 10, as related by Tournely 1.c., where above the aforementioned words it is said: Those who are called Chorepiscops, even though they may have been consecrated as bishops, etc. The question therefore is about the diaconate and subdiaconate. Others affirm, as Croix n. 2212 qu. 1 cum Diana et Major. et Aversa Abbatis bus Cisterciensibus ab Vasq. et 103 qui refert verba Bullae, nimiru: Ne Monachi pro suscipiendis Subdiaconatus et Diaconatus Ordinibus extra Claustrum discurrere cogantur tibi et successoribus ut Religiosis Subdiaconatus et Diaconatus Ordines conferre possitis auctoritate Apostolica indulgemus. Others however deny, as Sot does. Th., qui expressè docet 3. part. qu. 3. art. 1 ad 5.

The Pope cannot be committed to a simple Priest so that he may confer greater Orders. Others finally probably with Gran. They, however, affirm concerning the Subdiaconate that its office does not have so immediate a relationship to the body of Christ. Neither do they say that this hinders it. Thomas however (as they say) excluded only therefrom the greater Orders, which have always been held in the Church for sacred purposes, as from the words of the Angelic Hierarch who speaks of Ordinations, which Chapter II.

Dub. Thomae; nam (ut ajunt) S. Doctor tantùm ibi exclu sit Ord'nes majores, qui semper in Ecclesia pro sacris habiti sunt, ut infurtur ex verbis ipsius Angelici, qui loquitur de Ordiuibus, qui \ \ \

Christ, according to D. Thomas; for only Priests can consecrate the Eucharist, only Deacons can carry it or minister to it. Regarding however the granted indult for conferring the presumed Diacothon to the Cistercians, they doubt with many others; or they consider it as having followed a probable opinion of those who contend that in this the Pontiffs can dispense. Question 2: Whether abbots can confer tonsure and minor orders upon others than their own regular subdeacons? Formerly, however, they were able because of the privilege granted to them in VII. The Council, as is found in c. Quoniam, Dist. 169.

However, the Council in its session 23, chapter 10 thus decreed: The Abbot... shall not be permitted in the future... to confer tonsure or minor orders upon any person who is not subject to him as a regular, notwithstanding any privileges... customs, etc. Nevertheless, this Decree notwithstanding, it is said in c. 7 of d. 191, § 20, with reference to c. 4 n. 35 cum Cov., and c. 4 n. 35 cum Molf. Leandri et Aversi sanciunt quod probabile est, abbatis (nimirum primatissimis qui habeant jurisdictionem episcopalem, ut idem limitent cum omnibus c. Abbatisus hoc concedunt), possint etiam hodie minores ordinis conferre non solum suis subditis, sed etiam secularibus qui litteras dimissoriales a suis praelatiæ acciperint. They admit however [that] according to . . 32. they may ordain seculars who are already subject to them, or others possessing Letters Dimissory from their Primate; because these latter become subjects by reason of the license of their own Princes. Lib. 277. VI. Treatise.

V. Concerning the Extreme Unction and Order of the aforementioned Abbots; thus it has been repeatedly decided by the Sacred College of Cardinals S. C. Barbosa, Diana, and others in chapter c. But today all these opinions are no longer probable, since in the decree and approving Urban VIII, and having commanded that it be inviolably observed, it was established that every contrary opinion should be declared invalid, and the Benedictine Abbots' Congregation. Cassinensis, seu aliarum Congregationis vel Ordinis aut Institutionis habentium praesumptionem episcopali juris et facultatem minorum ordinum conferendi, non posse ordinare praeter suos subditos regulares, alios sive regulares sive saeculares praesumptionem habentes dimissionis a suis Ordinariis. And thereupon a suspension is imposed both on those who ordain and on those who grant dimissories, if they act otherwise. Item hic notandum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Eadem S. C. diem 17 Decemb. 1618 (ut refert idem Bened.

XIV. n. 15.) In certain matters concerning the Abbot of S. Rufillus it has

been declared that if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can be confirmed through another triennium following the period of supplementation because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary elections, but not extraordinary, should apply; nevertheless, even though it may pertain to a separate territory in which the aforementioned Abbot had quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, he could not concede letters of dismissal to his subjects, if for supplementation a Confessor is elected, he can be confirmed through another triennium following the period of supplementation because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary elections, but not extraordinary, should apply; however, this obstacle is set forth at 10 where it was said: Nor... Abbots, and others exempted, or Chapters whatever of cathedral churches shall presume to grant letters of dismissal. Secular clerics let them be ordained by others, but the ordination to the episcopate, within whose diocesan limits they exist, belong to [the bishops]. However, they are to be received (as the aforementioned Ben has observed). XIV. ibid. p. 131) some Abbots, who are permitted by a special privilege obtained after Trent to concede letters of dismissal to their own secular subordinates, as is the case with Abbot Cassinese by the privilege of Sixtus V., and Abbot Cavensis by the privilege of Paul V., and others noted in the Cardinal Vicar's Chancellery. Namque et Abbatcs, qui non sunt in alia Diocesi sed habent propriam et omnem jurisdictionem Episcopalem, possunt dare Dimissionis suis subditis, Cap. II.

Dub. I. Of the Sacrament of Orders. 273 seculars? It affirms at Croix l. 6 p. 2 n. 2235. Aversa cum Molfes, qui affert Declarationem S. C. et Sed P. Zacharia-charia ibidem refert, oppositum sancitum fuisse aliàs tam à S. C. quàm à S. censuit S. C. apud eumd.

Croix, loc. cit., n. 2236. Here is doubted whether Abbots, who can appoint their own regulars and professed to orders, can presume to ordain novices of their own? They deny, Palaus, p. 14, n. 211, that novices can be properly called regular and subject, because they can possibly return to a secular way of life. But more probably affirm 6 c. 10 n. 22, when it says that Peñiz and probable Croix thinks n. 2199, because in the favorables for Regularium comes the presumed novitiate. Autem, si tales novitii debent ordinari a Episcopo loci novitiatus, an vero originis vel domicilii?

Suarez et Sed 4 c. 39 n. 20. et Delbene dub. 3 sect. 8 n. 7. et idem tenet n. 8. censent eos posse ordinari ab Episcopo loci ubi est novitiatus quia novitii ibi degentes jam habent animi ibi perpetuo manendi. Ambas sententiae sunt probabiles, ut rectè dicunt Croix loc. cit. et Modò (omnino addendum dico) novitius per notabile tempus jam manserit in novitiatu, et

juramentum praesbyteri prætet ibi (quantum in se est), et perpetuo manendi juxta dicenda n. 769 ad V. Dubium. 2. Whether abbots ordering those who are not subject to them have validly ordered? They deny.

Pell. c. 4 n. 46. Because such a faculty is already found in Abbots. 18 274 Lib. VI. Treatise. V.

Regarding the Extreme Unction and Ordination, granted in the body of the law from the Decree Quorundam; Distinction 69: The Council of Trent and the Decree of the aforementioned Sacred Congregation seem to have merely prohibited the exercise of such a faculty; those who illicitly ordain abbots are doing so invalidly. And thus (as Benedict refers). XIV. concerning the Synod on page 1 of volume 1, it was declared by the Holy See on the day of the 23rd. November 1641 and confirmed on March 16, 1726, it was stated that those having from abbots such privileges solely need absolution and rehabilitation from the Apostolic See, but not reordination, as they are regarded as validly ordained. That is made more apparent from the Decree approved as stated above by the Pontifical See.

VIII. ubi ponitur suspensio Ordinatus ab hisce Abbatis bus, ideo ipsi jam habentur pro valide ordinatis. Nota II. It is probable that a Minister conferring temporary orders in minor mortal orders does not sin mortally, since it is sufficiently probable that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict according to the ordinary election, not extraordinary, thus such orders are not Sacraments, according to what was said in n. 736. It is certain, however, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be interpreted with regard to ordinary election, not to extra-ordinary one. Such Orders are not Sacraments according to what was said in n. 736. The minister himself (who presumptuously receives minor Orders) having been tainted by some censure, gravely sins and will incur irregularity in exercising the act of ordination; he who receives such censure with that act will likewise sin and incur suspension from the Order received. See 768 Notandum III.

Regulares ex cap. Cum Nullus, § fin de Temp. Ordinaries ought to receive Orders from the Bishop whose Diocese contains the Monastery where the monks are then residing. And although St. Pius V granted a privilege to Religious, so that they might be ordained by another than by the Bishop of the place where they dwell; nevertheless (as Concina p. 35 n. 10 relates),

Gregory XV revoked this privilege; and this revocation was confirmed by Clement VIII and Benedict. XIII. Bulla In suprema edita vicesimo tercio Septembris 1724 et novissime N. P. Benedictus XIV. in Bulla quæ incipit: "Impositi nobis," anno Domini millesimus septimus quadraginta septimus.

It is likewise to be noted, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood with reference to ordinary election, not to extraordinary. S. C. (as Roncevaux chapter 2 question 3 refers), under the mandate of Clement VIII, issued a Decree whereby it was declared that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementary service, he may properly be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously interpreted in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If, however, that Bishop lacks ordination, then the superior shall have power according to chapter II. Dub. I. Of the Sacrament of Orders.

275 To give Dimissories to any other Bishop for his subjects: nevertheless, it is prescribed there for Regulars that they may not defer Ordinations of their subjects during the time when the Diocesan Bishop will not be present at the Ordination, or after he is expected to become so; against this, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strictly to be accepted concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, if such a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as it is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Hence it says: And it is prescribed the observance of this Decree under the penalty of deprivation of voice and office. He confirmed all these things, Bened. XIV. In mox citata Bulla et insuper statuit, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si Episcopus Diocesanus fuerit absentem vel non habuerit Ordinationem, non possit Religiosus ab alio ordinari nisi ostendat attestationem Vicarii Generalis, Cancellarii aut Secretarii ejusdem

Episcopi; alias tam ordinans quam sic ordinatus incurrit censuras et poenas quas incurrunt qui ab aliquo Episcopo ordinantur sine Dimissoriis. Item statuit, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. talis Regularis examinari debeat ab Episcopo ordinante. Item, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Privilegia alicujus Ordinis ut ejus Religiosi ordinentur ab quo-cumque Episcopo debeant esse nominatim non verò per communicationem.

Item, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Regulares nequeant alio discedere, ut ordinentur, et postea redire ad pristinum domicilium ad hoc, ut examinentur ab Episcopo loci. But let it be said and Passer. If a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. If therefore a Monastery be situated in the place of no Diocese, its Religious may be ordained by the Bishop nearer. All Regulars, being dismissed by their Superiors, receive Dimissories. See no. 790 to be said.

Nota IV. Concerning the lawful orders to be received, it is commonly understood that they are derived from being ordained either by one's own Bishop or by another, but with his permission. But if he himself gravely sins and is suspended from the exercise of the Order received, until the proper Bishop wishes; and the one who ordained incurs suspension from the conferral of Orders for a year: and in the meantime, if the suspension be notorious, whether de facto or de jure, clerics (but not laity) can be ordained without his license by neighboring Bishops, as is expressed in cap. 2 de Temp. Ord. in sexto lib. VI.

Treatise. V. On the Extreme Unction, and as it is extended in full, see Cross no. 2166 and the following. I. It is insufficient if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, and it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious, strict, and binding in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary; for he who is about to accept the Benefice from some Bishop immediately, so that he may be ordained by him or receive the first tonsure.

II. Initiated by tonsure or minor orders from his own bishop, he cannot subsequently be ordained under another title of benefice; unless prior testimonial letters are exhibited from the bishop concerning both his origin and domicile regarding his birth, age, and manners. III. No Episcopus, licet etiam Cardinalis, liceat externum sibi non subditum ratione originis vel domicilii ad Clericalem Quare non bene 2177 cum Bon. Barbos. and common, against v.

Note 1. Fourth. Whoever is fortuitously born in some place should be ordained by the Bishop of that place where his father was born (unless the father himself, where he was born and initiated, has subsequently settled elsewhere). Nevertheless, he should obtain certificates of testimony if he has remained there for such a time that he could have contracted an impediment there. Analogous equally will require Testimonial letters from the Bishop of his origin, who similarly in the place of his own origin might have been able to contrahere impedimentum. V. Congruent pariter indaget Testimonialibus Episcopi originis, qui in loco suae originis similiter impedimentum contrahere potuerit.

He alone is to be considered subject by reason of domicile who comes with some permanent intention to remain there, and this intention will be approved either through ten years of residence or through the construction of a house accompanied by the removal of most goods, and while remaining there an almsman may be chosen as a Confessor for supplementation, which can be sufficiently confirmed by another

triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously, strictly, and bindingly in respect of ordinary elections, but not extraordinary ones; this is notable. Time demands that he swear that at that time he will have such an intention. VI. That the Bishop may be able to ordain someone by virtue of familiarity, it is necessary that he have him under his actual service for a period of three years, and within one month confer upon him a Benefice sufficient for proper sustenance, together with Testimonials from the Bishop concerning origin and domicile. VII. That a Bishop may ordain someone by virtue of familiarity, it is necessary that he have kept him under his actual service for three years, and within one month confer upon him a Benefice sufficient for decent maintenance, together with Testimonials of origin and domicile from the Bishop. The Bishop of origin or domicile may presume to ask his subjects, with a Dimissory from another Bishop, who has ordained someone presumptuously, to present within some time the testimonial letters of those who have received orders, in which it is observed what this Bull prescribes; otherwise he may suspend them from the exercise of the received order. « 1.

Who is born in one diocese; has his domicile in another? » » domicile, in a third diocese, from any one of those three bishops, can receive either Ordination or Dimissory letters? i4 . 5 t. 9 c. » 9. dict, even though he has received one Ordination from one of them, can nevertheless receive another from another. » See the aforementioned [references] in the previous number below [reference] No. II » 2. May anyone be ordained as an original, where himself or his father is born. Respuesta 12.

Nevertheless, it does not happen that he is ordained by the Bishop in whose diocese he has been born unlawfully: for example, this occurs because his mother was engaged there on account of some journey or business, since he does not acquire the civil status of origin there, but rather where his parents have a home; and there it is considered that he was born. R. 11 contra *). He who in different dioceses possesses two sees, in which he dwells equally, though not mathematically, can be ordained by either whichever bishopric he pleases; lib. 278. VI. Treatise.

V. Of Extreme Unction, and Order. because each is subject in reason to domicile. Prior. I. c. R. 14.

However, nevertheless, His children only from that one, in whose diocese He was born. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a confessor

beyond three years, as being odious and strict in ordination elections (which are ordinary) rather than extraordinary, allows such confirmation; if he happens to have been born outside both dioceses, he can still be ordained; for each bishop is reckoned his originator, since there is no more reasonableness in preferring one over the other. Prep. c. Natus autem ex fornicatione, matris potius quam patris domicilium sequitur. Prep. c. R. 18. 774 Potest quis ordinari ab Episcopo Beneficii, licet Beneficium sit simplex, modo sit perpetuum, et initandus illud jam possideat. And the same is said of him who possesses a perpetual commendation, which passes into a title.

Thus. Turned aside. c. 4 n. 51 et 52 comm. They say, as the same authors affirm, that if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, must be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary one. This suffices for a slight presumed benefit; however, this is explicitly rejected in the decree Bulla Speculatores n. 770 ad n. III., from which it requires a sufficient benefit for sustentation of himself without supplementary patrimony; see Croix n. 2168. And this is to be noted with Croix n. 2178, a mere title of service, whether monthly, ecclesiastical, or parochial, will not suffice; for truly these are not benefits. Omnino a Beneficio detrahenda sint onera Misarum?

S. C. (ut refert Benedictus. XIV. year 1723 responded, that to be left to the discretion and conscience of the Bishop. Note however, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For in our kingdom Benefice, so that someone may be ordained there, he ought to ascend, deducting burdens, at least to half the tax of the statute for patrimony. 775 But doubt: whether the Bishop of the Benefice can grant dispensations for vacancies in the same manner as the Bishop of the domicile could? They deny; but more truly do they affirm. 4 n. 53 cum Garc. et; modò, intelligendum, accedat necessitas vel utilitas (respectively ad Ordinem qui confertur) Ecclesiae, cui Ordinandus adscribitur, juxta dicenda n. 795. Dubit. 2. an rite Episcopus ordinet aliquem cui 75 ideo contulit Beneficium ut possit eum ordinare?

They deny [that], Quaranta, c. 4 n. 54, because such a conferral would be to the detriment. It is very probable that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time

of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary; which they hold. And this opinion is supported by the Reason, because in no way does it infringe upon the law, but discharges itself according to its own right, from the Regulation of Jurisprudence in 6. It is not considered to act through deceit who uses his own right. It is held, however, in c. Cum nullus de tempore. Ord. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. indistincte concessum sit Episcopis ordinare alienus ratione Beneficii.

4. Whoever possesses more in various dioceses bene-??" faculties, can be ordained by any of those bishops' orders. c. etc. t. 2. Response 25. » *(They also say. In the places where they have been explained, the place is observed in which they have been explained: Students who reside in the University for more than a decade, with an intent to return home, do not contract domicile there; consequently, they cannot be ordained by the ordinary bishop of that place.

Otherwise, if they bring a wife herein, nor their sons; for it is not congruous that he be called Bishop with respect to the domicile of his father; thus neither the Bishop with respect to the origin of his offspring, which is feigned in the domicile of the father. R. 15 and 17. Note 1. If a penitentiary is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary one; although to acquire a domicile, the presumption 775 suffices for receiving sacraments. If a penitentiary is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary one; although to acquire a domicile, the presumption 775 suffices for receiving sacraments. Whoever begins to reside somewhere with an intention of remaining there perpetually; whereas for effecting the reception of orders, beyond the aforementioned intention other things enumerated in the Bull Speculatores under d. n. 770 infra n. V., and especially the vow of residing perpetually there, are required. Moreover, it must be noted further, if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, he may properly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition

against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in ordinary election, not extraordinary, is to be understood; that is, it is necessary that one who intends to begin living somewhere do so with the intention of remaining there permanently; however, for effecting the reception of Orders beyond the aforementioned intention, other things enumerated in the Bull Speculatores are required, especially the vow about permanence of residence there. S. C. which pertains to P. Zachar. according to Croix 1:6 p. 2 at n. 2166.

But still the son of the family living separately from the father can dispose of the house at home. VI. Treatise. V. From the Treatise on the Last Rites and Order, to acquire an understanding, according to chapter l.

It is pleasing, and it is laid down in the law. Not indeed, B. To Munif. The same decree was issued by S. C. (as attests P. B.), yet nevertheless to the contrary agrees L. 3 d. 23 n. 1 et 2 c. 4 n. 48 with Adversary: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict in the context of ordinary election but not extraordinary, permits this confirmation. If someone after residing in one place has an intention to move elsewhere, he can be ordained by the Bishop of that place where he resides: for the dissolution of residence requires not only the will to depart from it, but also a presumptively actual withdrawal. This is evident from many examples. Declare.

Sacr. Congr. ut ref. ut P. Zachar. apud Croix l. 6 c. 2 n. c. 2176. 779 Not. 2. Si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Barons and their sons shall rejoice in their own domicile of fiefs, although they do not reside there, and thereby may be ordained by their Bishop. Thus . l. c. cum . Gob. apud Croix ibid. de Senatoribus et officialibus perpetuis aliquorum locorum, et eorum filiis; sed merito haec ait Croix ibidem non esse conformia intentioni Bullae Speculatores relationis, ubi ut vidimus requiritur ut ordinandus ratione domicilii per notabile tempus ibi permanserit et habeat animum (et juret) ibi perpetuo manendi.

It is presumed that a subject of the Bishop may be confirmed by another

three years after the term of supplement, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, since it is odious and strictly to be received in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, applies to Orders 380 that are to be received on account of familiarity or servitude; nevertheless (as it has been sanctioned), but generally do Avers say. Philip and others with Benefice, I should now be held as vacant; although it is not conferred before Ordination, namely according to the text 55: By the relatum however Bulla Speculatores suffices if Benefice is conferred within a month. See no. 770 ad no. VI: Declared however the Sacred Congregation that it is not possible for a Bishop to ordain any to the title of familiarity, even if he grants him a pension or patrimony. See P. Zachar. according to Croix l. 6 p. 2 ad n. 2167. By the name of familiars.

Chapter II. Dub. I. Concerning the Sacrament of Orders. 281. It is understood that all who are served by the Bishop and live at his expense, even if they do not reside in his buildings, must be located either in the place where the Bishop resides or very nearby; some say a distance of ten leucas; others two days' journey. However, according to Dict. 5 n. 12 et 13 with Garc. and Armendar, who cite this decision from the S. C. (contrary to and Leand.), it is held that the Bishop can ordain his family triennially even for a titular patrimony or pension due to necessity or utility of the Church, to which he is related; whereas Vasq. and Gabr. consider him capable of ordination even if he does not possess a patrimony; but they designate this opinion as falsely so-called. Furthermore, Renzi from no. 8 with Garc.

Riccio, et Molf., qui etiam à S. C. hoc asserunt, sufficiunt ei triennium iam incompletum antequam esset Episcopus. They nevertheless commonly advert to Renzi 1. c. cum . March and Leand., et hoc autem intelligendum moraliter, unde censet Renzi ibidem non interrompi triennium si familiaris per aliquod tempus alio discedat; idque probat ex capite fine de capite septimo de dubia primo 27 n. 3 et Sayr. Ugol. et aliis pluribus, non posse Episcopum dispensare super interstitis cum familiari ordinando ad titulum Beneficii statim conferendi, quia hic nondum est subditus, et ita refert decimum à S. C. Garcia apud Renzi loc. cit. Nevertheless, it may be granted a dispensation after having received the Benefice, because by reason of the Benefice received he is already subject, as Piasec. and Campanile say, referring to the decided case. But this must be understood (as we said in n. 775), if there be necessity or utility for the Church. 282 Lib.

VI. Treatise. V. Of Extreme Unction, and Order. It is inquired whether the domestic servants of the Bishop can be ordained from this same title by

him on that account?

They affirm. Book 7, Chapter 3, Doubt 20, Note 24. 4 Rituals 145. Turned aside. Now let it be far from fraud, nevertheless, if the Bishop permits his relatives to have more servants so that they may be ordained; and now all expenses of the Bishop are supplied, as they say there. Reason, because these all then are reckoned as the servants of the Bishop himself. ## DUBIUM II. ### What is Required in Ordination. 781 By what means is ordination valid or invalid? 782 Are infants ordained validly? 783 What is required so that one may be ordained lawfully. ap. Busemb. 784 I. ut sit viator, non neophytus, non infamis, hermaphroditus, irregularis, etc. An autem remaneant ordinati irregulares, etc., quos Episcopus protestatur se non intendere ordinare? 785 II. Mind or intention to clericalize.

Dubium 1: Si suscipiens ordinem peccaverit, nolens ascendere ad ordinem superiorem? Dub. 2. Can a cleric commit a sin in小事完成 Dub. 5 Whether it is a sin to accept tonsure in order to avoid the forum? 786 III. That it may be confirmed. 787 IV.

That it may have Letters of dismissal. Nota. 1. Bishops are by themselves habitually bound to ordain regularly. Not. 2. License granted does not expire with the death of the grantor.

Not. 3. Confirmed bishop can concede dimissories, but not suspension, etc. Not. 4. While a bishop can grant one presumptively in another diocese existing, he cannot. Not. 5. But the Vicar General cannot do so. 788 Not. 6. What about the chapter when the see is vacant? Note 7: What about the Abbots?

Novercissimo. To whom Regulars ought to have Dismissals? Not. 9. What if the Pope grants permission with a clause that one should be ordained only by his own Ordinary? Not. 10.

What if the Pope grants permission with a clause that ordination is to be conferred by one's own Ordinariate only? A bishop can ordain one who has a dimissory letter. Not. 11. Debet An ordinatio fieri a certo episcopo designato?

Not. 12. The license sufficiently pertains to oral matters. 789 Dub. 1. An episcopus possit ordinare alienum sub spe ra- Cap. II. Dub. I.

Of the Sacrament of Order. 283 tiabitionis? Dub. 2. Whether an ordaining bishop can dispense with someone else regarding irregularity, etc. 790 V.

Examination concerning science, according to the quality of the Order to be received. Question 1. What ought the Priest to know, especially regarding the Sacrament of Penance?

QUESTION 2 Whether the illiterate are bound by the rule? Q. 3. Is lesser science required in Regularibus minors? What more is there to note regarding the examination? VI. Title of the defense, of which see further below under no. 813. VII

That the Orders be gradually received. 794 VIII. That Orders may be received at the proper time. Whether it is licit to ordain more than two in Minor Orders on Feast Days? That intervals may be observed. Whether someone who receives two sacred orders on the same day incurs suspension? What if on the Sabbath he receives one [Ordinary], and on another day, namely Sunday, the other?

Dub. 1. Whether this suspension be a matter of general law? Dub. 2. Does he incur a suspension who takes up two sacred Orders, without observing the intervals? 797 Is it permissible to take up four minor Orders along with Subdiaconate on the same day? Dub. 1.

Does custom contrary excuse? Dub. 2. Is one thus ordered liable to suspension? Dub. 3. Can Regulars be ordained outside of times?

Dub. 4. Whether they themselves can then ordain anyone on any double festival? What concerning the initiation on three festive days? 798 X. That the proper place may be preserved, and that the existence of the Bishop in his own diocese may continue. And as is fitting.

Otherwise, one incurs suspension. Dub. 1. Does one incur this penalty who is ordained before age through gross ignorance? Dub. 2. Is one ordained improperly and before age, able to complete the ordination and thereafter exercise the Order with a malicious intent?

Dub. 5. Does he incur an irregularity by receiving the Priesthood before age? But as for the irregularity which is ordered after revocation by censure? See there above. Can an Ordinariate remain valid if its age is completed in the evening and begun in the morning?

Doubt. 2. Is a bissextile year to be reckoned as one year? 801 XII. Exercise of the Order undertaken. XIII. Expensa Eucharistiae.

XIV. Morality of life. Divine calling. What are the signs thereof? 803 Does

one severely sin who is ordained without a calling? Does the Bishop sin by ordaining him thus? 284.

Lib. VI. Treatise. V. On Extreme Unction and Order. 804.

This calling requires all the more to be accepted for episcopal office and parish to be assumed. What are the duties of ordinators? 781. "Resp. 1. For a valid ordination it is required and sufficient that he be baptized male. S. » 1. Con. d. 20 d. 10. Vasq.

Underwhere resolves. 1. It is incapable of Orders, and indeed by divine law. I. Female. Vasq.

Queen. Fill. 1. c. * (Ita S. Thom. Suppl., q. 39, art. 1. tr. 8 c. 5 n. 6 et alii communiter; estque de fide definitum in c. Nova, de Poen. et rem.) * II. Hermaphroditus, in quo sexus femineus praevalet Fill. 1. c. Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si au tem in eo incipiat praevalet post Ordinationem validam, non potest validè consecrare, vel absolvere, licet characterem sacramentalem retineat. 1. 1 d. 21.

III. Unbaptized, thereupon. 2. It is validly ordained 1. Perpetually defective in mind, blind, mute, and lacking hands, albeit they are naturally incapacitated.

Irregulars,尽管按教会法而言他们应被视为不胜任的，并且因之而被悬置。Children in cuui, qui tamen ad castitatem non ten- buntur vi voti, nisi id ratificaverint. . 13 c. 14. Boniface I. Chapter 782. Que. whether infants are ordained validly? They deny. Chapter 5, note 22.

But more correctly he affirms that an order is also lawfully received indeed (when speaking of minor orders), if there is necessity and hope of profit. Saint Doctor is commonly followed 1.7 c. 3 dub. 32 n. 2. Renzi p. 344 q. 2 et . 5 num. 23 cum S. Bonaventura. Scotto, et aliis; et hoc communis sensus DD. definitum testatur Benedictus. XIV. in the Bull Inter sollicitands, issued on the fourth day of May 1745.

That moreover Chapter II. Dub. I. Of the Sacrament of Orders. 285 D. proves per saltum promovendi, where it is said that if a Confessor is chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not

choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as regards ordinary election, but not extraordinary, allows that if a Confessor is chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary. If someone has received Subdiaconate before the use of reason, he should be ordained to Diaconate before, unless his reception be in doubt, otherwise if it be certain.

It is nevertheless affirmed by the same Angelicus, that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict to be received in ordination ordinarily rather than extra-ordinarily, is such that boys before the use of reason cannot validly receive the Episcopate. « Resp. 2. That the order be lawfully and according to the laws of the Church rightly received, or that no censure be incurred, requires in the recipient, besides the state of grace. I. That there may not be a neophyte: "And whoever would not be baptized, nor infamious, nor hermaphroditic, nor suspended, nor excommunicated, certainly would not receive the Order in the Prayer of the Ancients, it is not forbidden to name any saint canonized and also two, but not more, in the prayer even if they were not baptized." II. » Ut non sit neophytus Qui autem non esset baptiz. » in Oratione Aucntis non vetatur nominari quivis sanctus canonizatus, et etiam duo, sed non plures certe Ordinem non reciperet, ut constat ex » » non baptiz.) * vel infamis, vel hermaphroditus, » vel irregularis, suspensus, excommunicatus.

Mind of clerking: see above l. Chapter 4, Question 2, Decree 1, Article 3. Similarly, venial inconstancy seems to abandon without just cause the clerical state. III. That it may be confirmed. 8 p. 5 n. ro sub mortali; according to Soto and Suarez sub venialis.

IV. Letters » dimissoriae, presumed for the first tonsure, by bishops pro-» prii, sive originis, sive beneficii, sive domicilii. See V. Examination before the Bishop concerning the necessary knowledge for the use of each Order; for four years are required for the first tonsure, that they may know the rudiments of faith, and also to read, and write: on which there is a probable conjecture, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can be well confirmed through another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received for ordinary election and not extra-ordinary, for this reason, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can be well confirmed through another three-

year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received for ordinary election and not extra-ordinary. Clericorum elegerint; non fraudis secularis judicii fugiendi, sed ut Deo fidelem cultum praestent.

For our purposes, that they may understand the Latin language. For subdiaconate and diaconate, knowledge of those things which pertain to these Orders. For the priesthood such knowledge, that they may be able to teach the necessary things for salvation and administer the Sacraments VI. Title of sustentation, as of benefit, or of inheritance, or Lib. 286. Sixth.

Treatise. V. Of the Extreme Unction, and Order. "poverty, as in the Regulars, Bonac." VII.

The order between the reception of one [office], and of the other; the inversion of which, for example, to receive Diaconate before Subdiaconate, will be mortal: to receive Episcopate before Priesthood will be presumptuous and invalid. VIII. Time; thus minors may be conferred upon any Sunday, or feast day indeed such, if some Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious, strict, and to be received strictly from ordination proper, not from extraordinary ordination, which, since it is celebrated by precept of the Church, is reputed presumptuous in the forum, as Sylvest. . Urban VIII admonishes us that it has been rejected C. de Lug. lib. 1 resp. mor. d. 43. But the intrusion can be presumed from the received custom of the bishops, allowable on the sixth vesper on the eve of Saturday, by which all orders lawfully can be conferred, notes 2 t. 6 R. 28 ex IX. Intervals of time.

Thus, major orders can be conferred only after a year from another reception, according to 13 and 14; in which case the Bishop may, out of necessity or for the utility of the Church, by dispensation, permit it. On that same day however, two major Orders can be conferred only with the license of the Pope; but all minor Orders, dispensed by the Bishop, can be conferred on that same day; and if it is customary, together with subdiaconate. Henriq. 1. 10 11. Vasq. . Ordo. . 3 t 9 c. 8. » X.

Place, namely for a solemn collation, the Church, and for private [occasions], the Sacellum. XI. Age, in qua ordinariē Episcopus non potest dispensare; et sic pro prima Tonsura et minoribus requiritur saltem septennium completum, licet putet sufficere inchoatum. For the Acolyte,

twelve years completed; for the Subdeacon, twenty-second year, for the Diaconate, twenty-third year, for the Priesthood, twenty-fifth year, all initiated; for the Episcopate, thirty years completed. See.

Good Doe,第八十道第一个问题。 Fill. tr. 9 c. 4. . 5 tr. 9 c. » 6 et 7. If however there is a doubt whether anyone has the required age, for example, if someone entered the priesthood at the age of twenty-five, he cannot be ordained. Bardesane d. 6 c. 11 p. 6 § 2 see supra l. i tr. i c. 2 dub. 3. Sin autem et ordinator et ordinatus peccent, si quis non habens requiritas qualifications ordinetur. "However, all these matters are nevertheless to be discussed more thoroughly."

That each may rightly receive instituted orders, it is required that he be thus ordered. That he may be a traveler, because if the priest had lived his life unworthily, the consecration would not have been valid. Likewise, in order that he may not be a neophyte, nor infamous, nor hermaphrodite, who is incapable of the Order unless the male sex prevails therein, otherwise he cannot truly be called a man; hence neither would consecration be licit nor valid, nay, even if the male sex prevailed, it would not be licit or valid, because he would be a monster, and therefore performed under a Papal dispensation; likewise, it is required that he not be irregular, suspended, or excommunicated. This question arises: when the Bishop before ordination protests that he does not intend to order irregulars, excommunicated individuals, or otherwise ineligible persons, whether such irregulars would remain ordained? Mollæsius negat apud se.

Escob. 1. 23 n. 198. They however commonly affirm Cabassut. Treatise on Law I. 1. 3 chapter 16 note 15 Ludov. Bail. et Sa., what, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. This argument is inferred from the fact that if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. The same Bishop thereafter, according to this protestation before Ordination, may absolve from any excommunication, irregularity; etc. But rather it teaches better N. SS. P. Bened.

XIV. In the most renowned work, De Sacra. C. Concilii dicit: in hoc caso episcopum ordinantem interrogandum esse de suâ intentione et si ipse asseruerit se suam intentionem protestationi alligàssisse; ordinationem

absolutè iterandam esse; si vero episcopi intentio sit dubia, ordi-natio est sub conditione repetenda. And thus repeatedly the Sacred Congregation has held it fitting to refer to Father Zacharia; Cross l. 288 Lib. VI.

Treatise. V. Concerning the Extreme Unction and Order. 6. p. 2, ad n. 2231, where nevertheless it affirms other contrary Declarations by the Sacred Congregation, by which it stated the ordination to be valid of certain ordinands despite false Dispenses having been issued, although preceded by the Bishop's protest excluding the will to ordinate those who were deprived of the conciliar requisites. Requirement II. The intent to clericalize someone, from this there is doubt: whether he sins who receives some order unless with the intention of ascending to superiors?

It is certain common opinion that one does not gravely sin by accepting higher Orders even if he does not intend to accept the Priesthood, as rightly say 304 and others in various places, against Bannez, n. 363, who unreasonably assert it to be mortal (sin). But the same does not apply unless one accepts Benefice seeking the Sacerdotal Office, or a sacred Order, as those which are properly Benefices, or to which burdens are annexed such as singing Mass, preaching the Gospel, or delivering a Letter; as is stated in the fourth book. It requires in ordination an intention to offer a faithful cult to God: This is confirmed from chapter one of “De Filiis Presbyter.” Where it is said that Bishops can dispense from illegitimate impediments for receiving minor Orders but not major ones; therefore, it is licit to receive one Order without the intention of ascending to superiors. Reason, est, quia quilibet Ordo confert ad hoc ut ordinatus serviat Deo, proprio munus exercendo; sufficit igitur munus illud acceptare sine intentione ulterius progrediendi. Otherwise it would have to be said concerning novitiate, which is undertaken with an intention not to persevere; for such a one can more easily be excused from grave sin on account of temporal losses and inconveniences, by which religion then fruitlessly contributes, and presumptuously so out of scandal if a confessor should be chosen as a supplement; it could be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years is as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election as it is not extraordinary. It would also provide an example for other novitiates; indeed, the example of a fellow member brings great temptation to another. Doubt is cast.

Does a cleric commit a sin by marrying a woman after having been initiated into lesser orders? Speaking per se, it is certain that he does not gravely sin thereby, nor even presumptuously lightly, if he does this for a just cause, such as to appease hostilities or to moderate carnal desires, or to assist a poor woman, etc. Otherwise, it will not be excused as venial;

thus Bonac. de Matr. qu. 3 p. 9 n. 2. . . Aug. c. 5 n. 5 i., who say: this opinion is held by all except one Cajetan, who wanted to consider it as mortal. I said per se loquendo; nam si quis certus est de sua vocatione ad statum ecclesiasticum, ab illa recedit et in saeculo fruatur, utrum graviter peccet? Vide dicta 1. 4 n. 78, ubi diximus hoc metuendum, ne forte existat in malo statu. Ques. 3 Whether he sins who accepts minor orders or the first tonsure with an intention to avoid the secular forum, and subsequently return to the world? There are three opinions; the first opinion, held by them, is that he does not sin in any way because he uses his proper right. The second opinion, which they hold, is found in De Matr., lib. 7, dist. 3, i., n. 17, and also in March.

Molf. Leand. et sic habetur: primordiales tonsurandas non initiantes... de quibus probabilitatis conjectura non sit, eos non saecularis iudicium fugiendi fraude, sed ut Deo fidelis cultum praestent, hoc vitae genus elegisse. Since therefore this crime calls the Council a fraud, it cannot be excused on account of grave guilt, which is thus ordered because it gravely defrauds the Church by diverting its sacred ministries to temporal ends. The third opinion, which is held by c. n. 10. cum 16 R. 61 cum Homob etc. according to the aforementioned authority, understands this as not committing mortal sin, because at Trent it is understood that someone commits fraud when he accepts Orders in order to flee a secular judgment already begun, and this very thing. VI.

Treatise. V. Of the Extreme Unction and Order, it will be mortal; otherwise, it will be merely venial, by reason of the ordination intended by the Church. I do not consider the first opinion sufficiently probable; rather, I consider the third to be probable, and the second even more probable, because it seems equally likely that someone would arrange an ordination with the intention of avoiding secular judgment in a particular case, as it does for the sake of escaping judgment of this kind for all cases. How then does one sin who receives a benefice with the intention of resigning it? See what is said at I. 4 n. 213. What.

I. where we said that this person is not guilty of mortal sin (unless the Benefice has attached to it a sacred Order), because it does not necessarily follow that such deordination is grave. It is required III. That it may be confirmed. But this is required under a grave precept, affirms Bonaccio in d. 8, p. 5, n. 10. To which 254 agree because here he would have sinned gravely, both against the usage of the Church and against the prescription of Session 23 of Trent where it is said: "Prior to tonsure, no one who has received the Sacrament of Confirmation shall be ordained." Others however, as finally others commonly do, according to 38 sectio 1. . 3 caput 5 quaestio 4. . paragrapha 8 nomen 6.

Mazzott. 1. c. with Victor and Philip and : Epistle with . Reg. Molf., quia licet verba Tridentini potius indicent decentiam quam praeceptum, tamen hoc contraire non excusat a levi saltem deordinatione. Requirement IV. That he may have Letters of Dispensation from his own Bishop.

Upon this requirement, much is to be noted in addition. Notandum est id: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod præscribit Tridentinum sess. 23 c. 3 ubi dicitur: Episcopi per semetipsos Ordines conferant; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. si aegritudine fuerint impediti, subditos suos non aliter quàm probatos et examinatos ad ultim Episcopum ordinandos dimittant. Indeed, regularly the Bishop is bound himself to ordain his own subjects, Chapter II. Dub. II.

On the Sacrament of Orders. p91 unless hindered by infirmity, as that Council states, or by some just cause, as they rightly say and c. with Hence probabilistically Croix n. 2243. this presumptuous admission is accepted, if the candidate were elsewhere, or it would be impedimentary for him to approach his Diocese. The Bishop himself ought to examine his own subject, as the Council above states; although he can with propriety commit the examination to another, thereby he may presumptuously send him to another Bishop that he might examine. But the bishop to whom the ordinand is sent can indeed ordain him without examination, but if he wishes, he can presumptively examine him, as properly stated and cited by Croix n. 2245, together with others. And this indeed will be safer, as Barbosa Alleg says, 7 n. 22. with Note 2. License granted to someone, so that he may be ordained by another Bishop, does not expire upon the death of the grantor, unless it is revoked by the successor; thus commonly. l. 8 d. 28 n. 83. . cum Bonac. et cum Henr.

Forty, Rod., and common opinion hold that grace, once given, does not expire with the death of the one granting it, according to c4 On Grace. Concerning Duty. Deleg. in sexto. To be noted 3. The Bishop having his own Diocese, if he is already confirmed, but not yet consecrated, can properly grant Dismissories; because this is an act of jurisdiction, which the confirmed one has already possessed by virtue of his possession.

Thus. 1. 7 c. 3 dub. 20 num. 31. et 59. Namque et Episcopus suspensus aut excommuni catus jam declaratus potest dimissorias concedere vel confessarios approbare et similia? They affirm; but they more probingly deny. Here he says properly in the case of ordination, wherein they examine their own competence, Chapter 292, Book VI. Treat.

V. From the Treatise on Extreme Unction, and in VI. It must be noted that a bishop present in an alien diocese: if he could properly concede dimissories there, since this is not an act of jurisdiction contentious-wise; thus as Gav.; and as Armendar., who refers to this decision. Notandum 5. Vicarium Generalem ne quire Dimissorias concedere, nisi expressam de hoc facultatem habeat ab Episcopo; vel nisi Episcopus sit extra Provinciam, aut distans per duas, vel saltem unam diem itineris a propria Diecesi, ut dicunt cum communi, et ac Barbos. cum . ex c. Cum nullus, de Temp.

Ord. in 6 ubi dicitur: Episcopo autem agente in remotis, ipsius Vicarii Generalis Sede vacante Capitulum seu ad quem tunc temporis spiritualium administra-tio pertinere possunt licentiam ordinandi dare. Verisimiliter vero dicit cum Joanne. Andrea, Molf. March. et Leand. affirmant: possunt Vicarium (ut diximus) ex pecu- liari licentia Episcopi, expressa vel tacita, Diuisorias concedere; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. confirmatur ex Glossa in d c. quae ait: Nisi habeant (ab Episcopo) speciale man- datum ad hoc. 988 Notandum 6. Chapter when the See is vacant once could grant dimissories; evident from what has been said in chapter Cum nullus; but this was subsequently limited thereafter in chapter 10 where it is found: It shall not be lawful to the Chapter while the See is vacant, within a year... to grant the license of ordination or to confer Dimissorius... unless some person (as is added there) be vested with authority to receive Orders during that year, seeking the favor by means of personal service for some Benefice.

Diversamente Capitulum patitur interdictum, et Vicarius eius suspensionem a officio et Beneficio per annum; nec non sic ordinatus, si fuerit in Sacris, suspenditur a exercitu Ordinis suscepti secundum arbitrium Episcopi futuri; si vero in Minoribus privatur privilegiis Clericalibus, sed hoc non ante sententiam judicis. Ita 65. cum. Aversa et; sed contradicunt 7 n. 11 cum Moneta, Riccio, et Garcia, asserens rectè dici etiam arctatum, qui ordinatus prima Tonsura est. præsentatus ad Beneficium: et Merola apud Renzi p. 35g q. 2 idem refert decisum a S. C., praesumptum pro non adhuc Tonsuratus, his verbis: Vicarius Capitularis, sede vacante, infra annum potest concedere Litteras Dimissorias ad

primam Tonsuram ei qui est præsentatus ab personis laicis ad Beneficium Ecclesiasticum juris patronatus ipsorum, ut ille obtinere valeat. However, Croix l.c., with Garcia, Ugolino, and Riccio, correctly asserts that it should not be called arctatum him to whom someone desires to resign a Benefice requiring an Order which he lacks. Here moreover it should be noted that if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, his confirmation can well be made effective through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict in regard to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones; this being stated in our Kingdom's Concordat, chapter 4 n. 9: "Vicars Capitular may not grant dispensations of dismissal letters to laici, artati for reasons of benefice, or chaplaincies, or even to those who having already received the first tonsure are presented to some benefice or chaplaincy requiring a certain order, with the express condition that in either case he who is requested to be promoted has not been previously rejected by the preceding Bishop."

See the other prescriptions in the said Concordat n. 830. Nevertheless, the Chapter, even while the See is vacant, can grant testimonial letters to someone who has another license to seek suspended Orders; thus Garcia and S.C. That being said, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not supplementary. Thus, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted, regards ordinary election, not supplementary. The Chapter, even while the See is vacant, cannot act per se, but through its own suffragans. Vicar General Lib. VI. Treatise. V.

From the Treatise on the Extrema-ratio and the elected Order; Croix number 2266 and thus it is referred to the decision of 8 S.C. on February 3, 1604. Here it must be noted: if a penitentiary is elected as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a penitentiary beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Furthermore, if a penitentiary is elected as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a penitentiary beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. When the See is

vacant, it can be suitably ordained within the year which has Dimissories from the deceased Bishop, according to what Barbosa Gonzalez commonly say, and . C. Idem dicitur de Regularibus intra annum afferentibus Dimissorias suorum Superiorum; his enim bene potest Capitulum licentiam concedere, ut ordinentur ab aliquo Episcopo. Translated:

C. The same is said of Regulars bringing Dimissories within a year from their superiors; for the Chapter can conveniently grant permission, so that they may be ordained by some Bishop. And thus the Dimissories granted by the Chapter are valid even after a year, even if a new Bishop has already entered; Gonçalves, Fagundes. XIII. Si fuerit concessum Vicario Capitulari post annum luctus Ecclesiæ dimissorias concedere, tamen facultas nostrorum regni in concordato sublata sit ei, nisi habeat expressam licentiam Sancti Generis. Council. Although however the Chapter is not able to concede Dimissorias within a year, they nevertheless say that 7 c. 1 dub. 26 n. 2 can yet grant permission to another Bishop for the Pontificalia, and similarly confering the Orders of the Clerics subject to said Bishop, or subject to said See which is vacant, who ought not to have the license to ordain from the Metropolitan nor from a nearer Bishop, but from the Pope, as the decision of Garcia apud Barbosam l. c. in Trident states.

But to this opinion opposes Croix n. 2257, saying that the Tridentine words quoted above obstruct it: "It is not permitted to grant the license for ordination or Dimissory Letters within a year..."; for, says Croix, the gerund of ordination is active, whence it does not belong to Ordinands but to the Bishop to apply it. Thus we are taught by many grammarians versed in grammar: such gerunds can be taken either actively or passively. And even the Council itself has repeatedly used the gerund in a passive sense, as stated in sessions 7, chapters 11 and 12 concerning Benaf. Chapter I. Dub. II.

On the Sacrament of Orders. b95 Powers concerning promoting to any office. And this is to be understood in its proper sense according to the Tridentine understanding concerning the reception of ordination more fittingly passively; for the Council adds that after the words it is not licit to grant the license to ordain or the Dispensatory Letters to someone constrained by an opportunity of a benefice. Whereby granting such permission refers both to the license of ordination and Dimissory Letters to some person in particular, namely when ordaining. Notandum septimum. Today it is no longer allowable to have that id if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strict, should be understood

regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. They say this and that presumption may be granted to them Dimissorias for receiving Orders from any Bishop or mitred Abbot.

Neither, however, mitred Abbots, even if they still have jurisdiction quasi episcopal, can ordain alien subjects, according to the decree of the Sacred Congregation referred to number 766. Neither other Bishops, except Diocesan ones (as we shall see soon), can ordain Regulars. Notandum 8: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Regulars exempted ought to have dismissions from their own prelates, namely general and provincial ones, as Diana, Philibert, and others commonly say; otherwise they sin mortally and incur suspension. Excepting this, according to the Decree of Clement VIII (as fully reported by Croix n. 2236), Dimissories are directed to the Diocesan Bishop, unless he be absent or not hold Ordination.

Nor does it hinder to say that regulars can receive dimissories from any bishop, provided that if a confessor is chosen as supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it must be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary; which, if a confessor is chosen as supplement, may well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, must be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary; which mandate of Clement has not been received, as he asserts. That decree holds good only for Regulars who are subject to that same Bishop. For in c. 3 de tempore ordinis in 6 it is generally prohibited, and the aforementioned Decree was most recently confirmed and amended by Benedictus XIII et XIV, see the mentioned n. 768. Ab quo ergo possint ordinari novitiae? See the aforementioned n. 764 and 765.

To be noted 9. If anyone obtains the faculty from the Pontiff, Lib. 296, Cap. VI. Treatise. V.

On Extreme Unction and Ordination: I state that Orders are not to be conferred extra temporals but with a clause by the Ordinary himself alone, such that he can with these Dismissals be ordained by another; thus Chapter 7, Question 1, Doubt 25, Note 2 says: "with this clause however, he himself suffers no prejudice when he himself grants Dismissals." Notandum ro. It is probable that a Bishop be able to confirm him who brings Dimissories of his own Bishop for Tonsure; thus Croix number 2239

with Rebuffo. And the same [author] states in Croix ibidem with Gobat: if anyone is dismissed to receive the Subdiaconate, but has not yet received the lesser orders, then he is considered dismissed presumptuously for the sake of the lesser orders. Nota 11.

Although on June 22, 1623 (in) the Sacred Congregation appointed for the affairs of the Kingdom of Naples decreed that no indirect dismissals without a certain Ordinary be permitted, yet in the following year on March 16, by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops it was contrary to have been decreed, namely if anyone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, he can adequately be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not extra-ordinary. The bishops of the Kingdom of Naples can properly ordain strangers with Dimissories of their own Ordinaries, although they are not directly addressed to a certain Bishop. Hence Mazzotta on page 250 and Croix number 2241 with Gobat and Quint probably say that if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning an ordinary election and not an extraordinary one. For if someone is dismissed for a certain Bishop, who is designated for grace in his own ordination, he can well receive from another Orders according to the rule of law 61 in 6: If a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received concerning an ordinary election and not an extraordinary one. For if someone is dismissed for a certain Bishop, who is designated for grace in his own ordination, he can well receive from another Orders according to the rule of law 61 in 6: ob gratiam alicujus concedatur, non est in ejus dispendium retorquendum. Nota 12. That a person be ordained by another Bishop does not require that he obtain from his own permission in writing, but it suffices if this is attested by witnesses or otherwise: thus 20 n. 4.

But there is doubt 1. Whether some bishop can ordain the subject of another bishop without his expressed permission, hoping for a ratification in the future? Paludan affirms. Granting this, in book 7, chapter 3, chapter two. Dub. II.

On the Sacrament of Order. 297 Dub. 20 n. 12, si inter Episcopum ordinantem vel inter initiandum et Episcopum proprium singularis

amicitia intercedit. But more correctly they deny, Croix n. 2238 et . Phil. et aliis pluribus. Reason, because from: Nist concerning the expressed license of the Ordinary place, as stated by that Council in session 14, canon 2. The Bishop himself may duly consider such an Ordination to be valid, and there is no need to recourse to the Supreme Pontiff, because he himself can absolve the one ordained from the suspension of Orders received, as conceded by Tridentinum; namely 15, c. cum Aversa, et Croix n. 2248.

When Del bene, and others, against Rebuff. An autem sufficiat ratihabitio, sive licentia praesumpta de praesenti ad ordinandum clericum alienum? It seems probable to me and to others that this could be admitted at least without grave fault. Dub. 2. Whether an Bishop to whom Dimissoriate letters are addressed can dispense with ordaining someone regarding irregularity or some other canonical impediment upon which the proper Bishop himself can dispense?

The first opinion affirms that which Sylvester V holds. Dispensation q. 9 n. 11 in fine, et Anglicana. Arm. ac Henr. apud Palam de Censure. d. 6 art. 7 n. 21. Because (as they say), if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary, because if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The bishop grants permission to ordain another, gives a presumed dispensation, since the dispensation should precede the reception of ordination; and they conclude this from chapter Praeterea de officio.

Judgment delegated where it is said: Ex hoc si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Causa sibi committitur super omnibus si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium,

prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Ead causa ipsam spectare noscuntur, plenariam recipit potestatem. The second opinion, however, being more probable, denies this; and Palau holds thus, l.c., 7 o.t. dub. 27 n. 2 cum l. 8 d. 1 n. 25 cum Sa, et Croix n. 2240 cum Diana. Reason, because privileges do not extend beyond the expressly stated case; and because there is no inference in disparate matters when a given faculty has not been granted along with another necessarily connected: as (wisely said by Sanchez) if the Bishop grants permission to the Parish priest to assist at some Marriage, this does not imply that he is permitted to assist at any other marriage. VI. Treatise.

V. Regarding the Extreme Unction and Order: to grant the faculty of dispensing in impediment; in which itself possesses power. That would be all the more valid if to the dispensations were added a clause: Provided however that no canonical impediment stands in your way otherwise. To the text above granted, it is replied that if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, must be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. There it deals with necessary faculty together with its connected matters, as the reader can see. Notandum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. ordinandus debeat semper habere Litteras Testimoniales ab Episcopo originis; etiamsi in aetate infantili ab illius Dioccesi discesserit, saltem ad testificandum de natalibus ac aetate, prout à S. C. resolutum refert P. Zacharia apud Croix lib. 6 pag. 2 n. 2251. 799 Requiritur V.

Examination of science. In hoc adver- tendum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. The Tridentine regulation requires those who are to be initiated into the lesser orders to understand at least the Latin language; as stated in session 23,

chapter 11: "Lesser orders, who can understand the Latin language during their leisure moments, unless it would seem more expedient for another Bishop, shall be conferred." Whether however the Bishop can ordain to the clerical office a minor who does not know the Latin language, if there is hope that he may later learn it. They affirm, etc., according to 45 n. 10.

But rightly they themselves and also Salsedo deny it. Reason, because that which, unless otherwise a bishop should seem to see it, would generally and commonly be understood by the DDs merely as interstices, but not in regard to knowledge. But it does not seem improbable with Sanchez and Rebuff., ibid., that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, his confirmation may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary, is if someone who is to be ordained does not yet know Latin as much as necessary, but it is certain that he will learn soon, then the Bishop may ordain him; but certainly better would it be in my judgment if he did not ordain. II. For those to be initiated to the Subdiaconate and Diaconate, the Council requires c. 13 that they be instructed in the letters and those things which pertain to the exercise of the Order.

Whether, however, a Subdeacon may lawfully be ordained or admitted to a Benefice who as yet does not know how to celebrate Divine Office, but probatively is presumed to be instructed shortly before Cap. II. Dub. II. Of the Sacrament of Order. 299 sends? Rightly affirming article 45, nu. 6, and Modò (understand) meanwhile assistance will be provided from another to recite.

III. Finally, in order that those who are to be ordained priests might understand for themselves what is necessary for all to know concerning salvation and the administration of the Sacraments, the Council desires that they precede with diligent examination. But here it is sought I. how those words of 791 are to be understood, "ad ministranda Sacramenta"? According to c. 1 dub. 45 n. 16 with Ledes., it understands: that they may know what is the matter and form of each Sacrament. But they rather say: Chapter 9, note 1, and decree 7; I ought to know those things which pertain to the sacrifice, and to the Sacraments of Baptism and Extreme Unction, of whose ministry it is; but as regards the Sacrament of Penance, there is no need for such knowledge as is approved by an authorized Confessor. Hence I infer, if a penitentiary be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another three-year period after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a penitentiary beyond a three-year term, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be

understood with reference to ordinary, not extraordinary, election. Every simple priest ought to have some knowledge concerning matters more frequently encountered which pertain to the Sacrament of Penance, at least for cases of necessity in which confessors are required to hear confessions.

And this is according to the doctrine of Saint Charles Borromaeus in the Council, for Innocentius XII confirmed it in the Bull, Apostolici ministerii. XIII. (among Benedict. XIV. Notif. 16 and 32) explaining the aforementioned Council text (as the aforementioned Benedict says. XIV.) Nullo aliud benignius interpretandi datur illud quam reducto ad studio theologiae moralis.

And the reason is because, since it is the proper duty of every Priest to administer Penance in necessity, each priest ought to know those things which pertain rightly to such an office; as clearly appears from this: if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is so odious and strict when applied to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, it teaches 5oo Lib. VI. Treatise. V. On the Extreme Unction and Order.

D. 2 ubi ait: Ad hoc si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria oportet si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary homo ordinis officium exequatur oportet si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary habeat tantum de scientia si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary sufficiat ad hoc si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinary dirigatur in qua Ordinis illius tido talis scientia requiritur in eo qui debet ad Ordinies promoveri Certainly, as [Natalis de notes. Reg.

22) agendum cum iis, qui Religionem professi sunt vitae contemplativae, ut sunt Camaldulenses, Carthusiani, et similes. Diversum autem est cum aliis, qui vitam activam profiteantur; in his enim eadem scientia requiritur, qua exigunt alii sacerdotes: quorum alii promoventur ad sacerdotium, cuius rei primo actu committitur (super corpus Christi verum), congruent Religiosi,... et.... taliis sufficit si tantum de scientia habeant; si quis confessorius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per alium triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessorio ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Ea quae ad sacramentum perficiendum spectant, rite servare possint. Alii autem promoventur ad... actum supra corpora Christi mysticum... unde scientia legis igitur eis esse debet, non quidem ut sciant omnes difficiles questiones legis, sed ut sciant quae populus debet credere et observare de lege.

And this very thing from that Malachi 2:7. The lips of the Priest shall keep the knowledge, and they shall seek the law from his mouth. Therefore I conclude: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not extraordinary, prevents those promoted to the Priesthood from having an adequate conscience for Ordination unless they know at least general principles by which they can resolve doubtful cases commonly occurring proximately to the dying; and are not required to distinctively know how they should act concerning the dying, namely, when they may absolve them? At the point of death, or in danger of death? And what kind of danger? Is the present Confessor approved?

Absolutely, or conditionally? When can they consider a dying person disposed to absolution? What should be imposed upon him if he has a case, or reserved censures? Hence consequently, the Bishop should not communicate with the sin of that person who asks for absolution without such knowledge as to be ordered; therefore, before ordaining him, he ought to become certain about such his fitness, or at least foresee soon, so that he might learn; otherwise I do not know how he could be safe in conscience. The more so if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict as it is in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, clearly holds that such elected ones, after their acceptance, shall remain.

Chapter II. Dub. H. Of the Sacrament of Order. 501 The Presbyterate, if

anyone is elected as Confessor for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is, insofar as it is odious and strict, to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if anyone is elected as Confessor for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus, no one else should be subjected to examination, if anyone is elected as Confessor for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this was the sole aim of all his studies. Hoc praesumptum advertendum est id, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria, quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. habetur in Concilio Lateran.

IV. 484) where it is said: "We command that in both Cathedral Churches and Conventual Churches proper men be ordained, whom Bishops may have as coadjutors, not merely for the office of preaching, but also presumptively for hearing Confessions and imposing penances upon penitents, and other things pertaining to the salvation of souls." Quaerit. II. May the illiterate ones be altogether irregulars? Navarrus Garcia autem et d. 7 qu. 2 pun. 1 n. 2 censent illiteratos non esse irregulares, ita ut non peccent, si in Ordinibus susceptis ministrent; sed hos non posse sine culpa gravi Ordines suscipere. Others however with the common opinion which they hold, according to lib. 7 cap. 1 dub. 45 n. 3.

Bonac. l. c. tit. tr. 4 c. 12 n. 1 l. c. n. 49 cum 'Reg. d. 6 part. 10 n. 1 cum . Fill. Sayr. et Avila, probabilius docent, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. illi; qui sunt adeo rudis, ut ignorent praesumptum prima rudimenta Gramma- ticae, ita ut nesciant praestare ea, quae pertinent ad Ordinis exercitium, ad si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento,

bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. requiritur sane scientia linguae Latinae, ipsi sint prorsus irregulares, et gra- viter peccent tam Ordines suscipiendo', quam eos exercendo: et, ut dicunt cc. cum. et Reg. nec praesumptum Papa posset cum eis dispensare, quia haec irregularitas non solum est de jure humano, sed praesumptum divino et naturali; ipsum enim jus naturale dictat; non esse admittendos ad aliquod munus, qui nequeunt illud exercere. This is proven from the chapter Illiteratus. In Distinctio 36, where the illiterate (understand wholly illiterate, as the Glossa says, namely who if any Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, well can be confirmed by another triennium after time supplementary, because prohibition of not choosing Confessor beyond triennium, inasmuch as odious, strict and to be taken is from ordinariness election, not extraordinariness. that, if any Confessarius be chosen for supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

He heard grammar [Grammaticam audivit]; in like manner is he eligible for perpetual offices with greater vital vigor [arcteur a suscipiendis Ordinibus, pari modo ac corpore vitalius]. He objects to book 5 part 2 chapter/librium. VI. Treatise. V.

From the Tract, and in the Order: but if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be taken as odious, strict, and binding on ordinary election, not extraordinary. This ignorance alone will introduce irregularity which entirely impedes the exercise of the received Order: and thus also it should be held as irregular who does not competently and suitably administer the received Order. They admonish the presumptuous Anacl. concerning qu. 9 art. 4 n. 12: if a Confessarius be elected pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. haec irregularitas, sublata causa ignorantiae, de se tollatur sine dispensatione. Quærit. III. Is a lesser science required in the regulars when ordaining minors, than in the seculars?

For those who are devoted to contemplative life, as we said about the Camaldulenses and Carthusians, and similar orders, it is common among D.D.s that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be rigidly and odiously received in regard to ordinary election, but not to extraordinary. If, however, a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may also be well confirmed by an additional three years following the period of supplementation, since the prohibition against not selecting a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. In Religious who are ordained to the altar, sufficient knowledge suffices that they can observe those things which pertain to Sacrifice; and the same Natalius affirms. Reg. 22. It is difficult to say whether this can be said of Religious from other Orders who are instituted for an active life? They deny it lev. de imò majorem, because Religious are more frequently entrusted with the administration of the proximus; this seems probable to some. Yet it is commonly affirmed and stated in n. 296 and Diana p. 2 tr. 16. Reply 31.

Reason, first because Regulars are commonly ordained only to choir and altar; secondly, because if they are ignorant of other things, they can afterwards learn them from their associates, and he did not dissent from this judgment (as we have seen). But if a Confessor is chosen as an addition, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the addition, for the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus Barbos says: with some, namely when a Confessor is chosen as an addition, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the addition, for the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Since Regulars can be ordained even if they somehow lack proficiency in Latin, I do not dare approve; for if for initiating into minor Orders only in secular matters, Tridentine requires it, then if a Confessor is chosen as an addition, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the addition, for the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the triennium is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Nevertheless, how can Regulars be ordained to the priesthood if they still lack proficiency in Latin? Moreover, they add: c. cum: to suffice similarly for secular sacristans, cantors, and similar ones, so that they may know how to merely read, sing, and perform the ministries of the Order. An autem hæc doctrina sit verè et generaliter probabilis, nec audeo asserere: sapientibus me remitto. But herein to be noted is this: if a

Confessor shall be elected as a supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict that it should be understood in reference to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. For if a Confessor shall be elected as a supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict that it should be understood in reference to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. The bishop indeed ordains Religious monks without examination, relying on the consent of their superiors; but he himself, if he wishes, may examine them, as is rightly stated by Mazzolini toms 3 p. 253 and with Aversa, XIV (allated note 768), according to which it was established that Regulars should be examined by the bishop ordaining them.

2. Advertendum pro omnibus initiandis: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. The bishop shall examine himself or others in regard to them, unless otherwise he is certained by his own knowledge or by common opinion regarding their fitness; thus rightly presumptively cited. Furthermore, besides all that has been mentioned above, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be properly confirmed through another three-year period following the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, let the Bishop legitimately ordain those who request it if they bring knowledge which Trent requires; yet by this fact it is not thereby forbidden that he demand greater knowledge from his subjects (for regarding foreign matters one should think otherwise); especially if they are ordained for the Church of some great city, because the Council wished to set a limit only concerning scientific matters in order to prevent bishops from promoting someone lacking the prescribed knowledge, but did not forbid bishops to demand greater knowledge unless necessity of place wholly required otherwise. Hence most prudent D. Fabritius, Archbishop of Salerno (worthy of perpetual memory on account of his zeal in reforming the Clergy), admitted no one to the Priesthood unless he first ascertained by rigorous examination, even for hearing Confessions, that they were worthy. All would follow the example of this Prefect! Not in 304 [Book].

VI. Treatise. V. Concerning Extreme Unction and Orders, many useless priests were to come, nay rather harmful to the Church, because on that account, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium being so odious, strict, and to be taken with such severity for ordinary election, not extraordinary, these are such rudiments that they repulse study, and hence those who decay in idleness turn towards vices. Here presumptuously aside for correction, if a Confessor be chosen by way of supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, that such being unschooled, study disgusts them, and so, declining into idleness, they relapse into vices.

XIV. A bishop newly assumed to the episcopate can, for just cause, well examine Parochi and praesumptive Regulars; whence it follows that if a Confessor is elected for supplemento, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplemento, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, makes him even more able to examine non-curated confessors. Six is required. Title of substantiation; but concerning this, see the aforementioned in § II. ex n. 813. Requiritur VII.

That the lower Order be esteemed as superior: and acting otherwise one will not only gravely sin, but also incur presumption and suspension from the exercise of the Order until the Bishop dispenses, according to c. 1 de Clerico per salt. ord. He who however receives minor orders or tonsure presumptuously, will sin mortally but will not incur suspension; thus [according to] 7. c. 3. dub. 14. And if on the other hand someone receives episcopal or sacerdotal ordination invalidly, as they teach in 1 n. 41. Si vero quis suscipiat Sacerdotium ané alios Ordines, posset certe Episcopus fieri et validè hic suum munus exerceret; non tamen licite ané susceptionem Ordinis omissi. It is required VIII. That it may be ordered at the proper time.

It can be conferred upon only the three greater orders on the four Ember Saturdays: the Saturday before the Saturday of the Lord's Passion and the Wednesday of Holy Week; but minor orders may be given on any festival day provided it is by command, as explained in the Pontifical where it says: It is permitted to Bishops for the Lord's Day and other feast days to promote one or two individuals to minor orders. Whether, however, it is

licit to ordain more than two? Martin à S. Joseph negat; sed communiter DD affirmant, modo generali ordinationis fieri non videatur; ita 52 n. 8 cum Innoc. Table. Arm.

Heur. Refusal. Preface chapter 4 note 78 with Chapter II. Dub. II.

On the Sacrament, p. 364, q. 8 with Sylv. 66. with others, and Glossa in said chapter De eo, v. To two, where it is said. Is it pure? Yet let it not seem to be a work of human ordination. The reason is what the words of the text are not appositively or restrictive, but explanatory. Moreover, Fagnan says, in d. c. De eo, n. 36 with Host. 13 n. 2 with Henr. cum Gran. and . 8 c. 1 cum declaratione S. C. ap.

P. Zacharia-charism in annot. ad Crouci 1. 6 p. 2 n. 2200. Minor orders can be conferred presumptively publicly on Friday six days before the Saturday of the general Ordination (and presumptively on Friday four). Four times, as he adds; provided that there be a custom, which Palaus, c. with others, attests to have already been received. Episcopi consecratio potest fieri quovis die Dominico ex c. Ordinationes 1 et c. Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria die dist 75. And Diana p. 12 tr. 1 R. 6r adds ex Pontificali that it is possible to presume that natalities of the Apostles can be celebrated.

The first tonsure can be conferred on any day and in any place; dub. 50 n. 1.. It requires IX. That it be ordered by due intervals of time 795 interstices, which thus are to be observed: I. In order that promotion may be made from one lesser Order to another is required some time; if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extra-ordinary, was not determined by Tridentine; but in this matter the Bishop may dispense with cause, during the interstices of times, unless another Bishop see fit to intervene. It seems rather that they be conferred. It seems that just causes for dispensing are (as the Holy See itself says) those of a too advanced age for ordination, a cause of study, and the stretching or receiving of benefit, or of receiving it. What interval however should intervene between one Order and another, Mioperem, Mujol. and Ugol. in the first book, chapter four, consider sufficient the interval from one general ordination to another: but.

Sorbo, and Campitelli say in the same place that it is sufficient from one feast to another. But it was deemed worthy to say in Lib. 20, cap. 306. VI. Treatise. V.

Of Extreme Unction, and Order. The Bishop may grant this dispensation for any cause, yet it would be commendable in him to abstain from such a dispensation. Furthermore they say Sylv. v. Order 2. n. 7 and Rebuke. Henry.

The belfry is situated at . 6- and tenth, it refers thereunto. Armendarius, non permettere conferre tonsuram simulcum aliquo ordine minori-nisi adsit ubi consuetudo; sed probabilius video oppositum, cum probabilius tonsura non sit ordines. II. That from the minor orders we may ascend to subdeaconate, requires a space of a year according to Trent. Session 23, chapter 11, says there: These [shall] be promoted from the name after the year following reception of the lowest degree of minor orders to sacred orders, unless necessity or the utility of the Church as judged by the Bishop expresses otherwise: for the Church, that is, the Church to which it pertains, as is clear. By "utility" is understood that which leads not to sorrow but to the good of the Church, as they say. But those who receive the subdiaconate before the year without dispensation would gravely sin but incur no censure: see III.

That is why ascent from Subdiaconate to Diaconate requires a year's space; yet in such a dispensation (as rightly Croix says, n. 2397), necessity or utility of the Church does not require it, but any reasonable cause suffices according to the Bishop’s judgment, as can be seen in the same place: where they are versed in the sacred Subdiaconate Order for a year, unless the Bishop sees otherwise, those promoted to that lower grade shall not ascend to a higher one. IV. That is, finally, as one ascends from Diaconate to Priesthood, it is required at least a space of a year; and for this dispensation of time, the utility of the Church is not sufficient, but there is required a presumed necessity, according to what is said in eod. 14: Those who are admitted into the presbyteral order shall have ministered at least an entire year in the Diaconate, unless otherwise seems good to the Bishop for the utility and necessity of the Church (note). Furthermore, it must be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in ordinary elections, not extraordinary, implies that whoever receives two sacred orders on the same day would not only gravely sin against the Tridentine precept in chapter 13, where it is stated: Two sacred orders are not to be conferred on the same day by regulars,

except by privileges or indults which do not prevent; but he would incur suspension from the exercise of those functions and fall into irregularity, as can be seen from the chapter Innotuit de eo qui furtive, etc., and the chapter Delectus de Tempore; then indeed (as the text says) the evening of Saturday and the morning of Sunday are counted for one day; but otherwise, if the fast is not continuous. From which it probablv follows, as Renzi says on p. 363, qu. 7, with Nicholas: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may properly be confirmed through another three-year period after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received for ordinary elections, not for extraordinary ones. For if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may properly be confirmed through another three-year period after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received for ordinary elections, not for extraordinary ones; moreover, if anyone shall have obtained permission to receive sacred Orders on three festive days, he may, after having broken his fast on Saturday, exercise that.

Ordering, to receive one on a weekday and another on the following Sunday, this decision refers to the Sacred. Congregation of July 25, I, 662. Moreover, they infer presumptuously probatively. 7 c. 1 dub. 51 n. 4. cum . Villal. et etc. apud Croix n. 2291. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si Episcopus propter infirmitatem vel aliam causam non possit Ordinationem Sabbato exercere aut eam absolvere potebit illam continuare die Dominica; modò ut ajunt continuetur jejunium tam ex parte initiandi quam ex parte Episcopi ut rectè addit. Et Tab. et cum Marchino et Leand. But here there is doubt i.

Whether the aforesaid suspension be held to extend widely to the sentence? They deny Diana, p. 5, tr. 10, R. 36, and Villal., according to Sed, rightly affirming Bonac., de cum, cap. Litteras, where it is thus stated: We wish the suspension from the exercise of sacerdotal office to remain in effect for so long that disposition may be made regarding it. This suspension, however, is incurred only by the last Order assumed, as well infers from the aforementioned words cum., et An., who takes two sacred Orders, provided there be no interruptions, otherwise incurs suspension? Response is given: He who is ordained during continuous days outside of time incurs suspension from the Bulls of Sixtus V and Clement. VIII. Insofar as it involves a presumed ordination without Letters of

Dispensation, or before legitimate age; see Tambur. 1. 7. c. 11 § 1 n. 3.

He who is ordained on various days; if he observes legitimate intervals but not the intercessions, would indeed sin gravely, but he does not incur suspension more probingly, as Bonac. says d. 8 p. 5 n. 35. Barbosa in Croix n. 2302. Reuzi p. 360 q. 1 cum. 1. c. cum. n. 457. cum. J. c. 16 n. 12. cum Navar. et Resol. 55.) For Sixtus V. imposed a penalty of suspension in certain Extravagantes; however, that has been annulled with respect to our case by Clemens. VIII. In Bullar., tom. 3, pag. 4o, ut refert: Quicumque eadem die suscipere quatuor Ordines minores una cum Subdiaconatu, praesumptum peccaret graviter, ut habetur ex c. 2 de eo qui furtive, etc., ubi dicitur: Quatuor minores Ordines contulisti, quibus non contentus Subdiacannotum praesumptum temerario ausurus cepit... Mandamus quatenus eum in minoribus dumtaxat celebrare permittas.

Nam etiam dictum praefatum textum fuisse revocatum per Trident. sess. 23 c. 13 ubi Concilium tantum inhibuit duo sacra Ordines simul conferri; sed haec doctrina- nam non communiter recipitur, quia Concilium id praescribendum textum non revocavit, sed illud in suo vigore reliquit. Here the doubt arises: whether the contrary custom should excuse this prohibition if it happens to prevail somewhere? They deny Sylvester. Chap. II. Doubt.

Second. Concerning the Sacrament; but more truly they affirm. S. C.) with. 445. with St. Augustine. Sayers. because such a custom does not seem to be anywhere condemned. Doubt. 2.

Whether so arranged, where no contrary custom is present, it would incur suspension? It is affirmed by Bonac. in "De Censur." d. 3 p. 5 § 1 n. 4. But more certainly they deny it, and C. N. 40 says that because in the said chapter 2 the Pontiff merely commands the Bishop not to permit the one ordained to minister, but does not suspend him. Nevertheless, deservedly against it was said. Higher orders are receivable, since it is thus subjoined there: But if (the one ordained) has entered a religious house; and his manners have been reported unfavorably, the Abbot (if he wishes), may dispense with other Ordinations in respect of others.

Si igitur indiget dispensatione, erit hic irregulärís ad alios ordines recipiendós. Dubium 3. an regulares possunt ex licentia sui praelatorum ordinari extra tempora? They deny Vasq. n. 464, because although this privilege was granted according to c. 8 n. 2. Barbosa with 4 n. 83 and 84 with Aversa, Philib. Portel. et .

XIII. Clément. VIII. He absolutely conceded this privilege to all Mendicants and the City. VIII. granted this privilege absolutely to the Order of the Barefooted Saints. And lastly Bened.

XIII. (among Benedict. XIV.) In the Council R., under title 5, chapter 2, this privilege was confirmed, saying: As for those privileges of the Regulars, which they have from Pontiffs either expressly or by way of communication, that sacred orders be received outside of established times, we decree in like manner with regard to Regulars, without derogation from the strength of such privileges having been proven. VI. Tract. V.

According to the new Apostolic Indulgence of the Extreme Unction and Order, one may be ordained outside of the appointed times. R. 97 et Praepos. . et Homob. apud item . et Manuel. apud Barbos. who considers this probable. And the same is stated by Croix n. 2203. with Gobat. Reason, because Alexander VI speaking about those who are to be initiated by this privilege said that ordination could be performed on three Lord's days or even on double feast days; but he did not speak of a precept, but only of double (to distinguish from semidouble) feasts, which in any case are not of a precept. But they deny more probablistically, as it seems, in 21, 1, c. 27, q. 19, and lib. i, dnb. 36, saying that they cannot be ordained except on a feast day of precept, in which the people are free from servile works. Reason, because speaking of this same privilege, he said on days of Sunday and feast days, but not on double feast days; also because a day of feast in its own proper sense denotes a holiday, as Ambrosius Calepinus explains in his words: "feast day."

And although the feast is received in the rubrics of the Missal and Breviary according to the distinction made from holidays, yet by law the feast is understood as a day on which one is relieved from laborious works. This indeed is the more secure opinion, and seems to be more probable; but I dare not condemn the first one, and say that it stands with the custom, which is the best interpreter of laws. However, if a Penitentiary is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Penitentiary beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be understood. Furthermore, those who obtain permission from the Pope to receive holy Orders outside the prescribed three feast days do not lack Dimissoria from their Ordinaries but only testimonial letters; without which, both ordainer and ordained would incur suspension: the former for a year from the conferring of Orders, the latter from perpetually exercising the Order received; as is contained in session 23, chapter 8 of Trent. Notaque ibi si

aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. hoc, dicatur de eo qui obtinet indultum suscipiendi Ordinem à quocumque Episcopo; alia etiam, etiam debet ordinari a proprio vel ab eo Dimissorias ad alium accipi. The license to receive holy orders within three festive days is understood such that the days are interpolated, as declared by Croix n. 230 from the Sacred Congregation Requir.

X. hoc dicatur de eo qui obtinet indultum suscipendi Ordinem à quocumque Episcopo; alias, etiam à proprio debet ordinari, vel ab eo Dimissorias ad alium acci- pere. The place for the collation of Orders, concerning which 798 in the statutes regarding holy Orders has been established by law temporal and at the Cathedrall Church, publicly celebrated before those present and invited Canonici to that Church. Si autem in alio dictae loco, præsente clero loci, dignior (quantum fieri poterit) ecclesia semper adeatur. I know nevertheless that many Bishops are accustomed to confer sacred Ordinations in private Chapel: perhaps this is the custom today. Add the name of the place, and even inquire about the existence of the Bishop in his own Diocese; for if he were to confer Ordinations in a Diocese alien to him, he would incur suspension from the exercise of Pontifical functions, and one who is ordained by him would be deprived of the exercise of the received Order, according to 6 Hoc tamen rectè dicunt cum Bon. Philip.

Lowly. If however a Bishop is asked by another; and has general Ordination within his own Diocese, he will be able to ordain not only his own subjects, but also those of other Dioceses, as was done together with common consent in the same AA., because Tridentum l.c. prohibited this only in a case where some Bishop might wish to ordain in another Diocese under pretext of some privilege without permission from that Diocese. An alio autem Ordinatio debeat fieri a. By whom celebrated be the Bishop? see what is said in no. 744. Not, II.

Require. Eleven; And thus. In that which is to be noted I, if a Confessor shall be chosen for supplementation, it can indeed be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary one. For the first tonsure to be required, that he might flourish by the use of reason, and thus at least be septennis, as said Blessed. XIV. In Bulla, Inter sollicitas, anno 1745 sectione XIX. But in the Concordat our Kingdom requires and at least one year.

For lesser ordinaries there is no assignment in law; but they are nevertheless customarily conferred (as says the same Bened., 312 Lib VI. Treatise. V. Of the Extremes and Order. XIV. ibid.) from an. 7 to 14.

For the subdiaconate, however, it is preserved for the age of twenty-two years. For deaconate, it is safeguarded for the age of twenty-three. For the Priesthood 25 Thus it suffices that the prescribed year be begun; thus commonly all, observe. Council session 24 chapter 12. Furthermore, concerning the Episcopate: a period of thirty years is required by custom, and the same is said regarding the Cardinalate, although this arises from concession.

Sixti V. Cardinals can be Deacons at the age of 22; see however for Benefices a period of 14 years is required by the Bull of Sixtus V. But if the benefice is a cure, a period of 25 years is required at least in inception; for Canonicate in Cathedrals a period of 22 years in inception is required, Trident. sess. 22 c. 4. In Collegiatis vero sufficit annus 14 cum in iure nihil pro eo si statutum; Salm cap. 5 n. 38. Note 2: Si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si quis sine legitima aetate scien- ter ordinatur, incurrat suspensionem perpetuam ipsa facto ab exercitio Ordinis suscepti; et Pape reserva- tam, ut habetur in Extravag. Pii II. which begins, Cum ex sacrorum, and is referred to in full by Barbosa Alleg. 17 n. 11.

But S. Pius V and Sixtus V augmented it, and Clement VIII confirmed it, as Escober reports, n. 365. If however the aforementioned suspension has been secretly contracted, then the Bishop can absolve the delinquent from it, by permission of Session 24 of Trent, as commonly say Bonac. de Censur. D. 3 p. 5 n. 2. et . But here there is doubt 1. Whether one incurs the aforementioned suspension who, out of gross ignorance (although not assumed), is ordained before the legitimate age?

They affirm, however, and Bonac says so in the same place; but it is more commonly and probably denied. D. 31 seot. r. . r c. 48 n. 7. Barbos. with and Avila, and with etc. The reason is because such a suspension was imposed by Pius II in the temeraries (while using the term temerity),

which are not those who sin from sheer ignorance. Cap. II. Dub. II.

Of the Sacrament of Order. 513 supine thus: as we shall say in chapter seven of Hinc dicunt praefatii AA., if a Confessor be chosen for supplementarily, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementarily, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious, strict and to be received strictly regarding ordinary election not extraordinary. Thus constituted, completed in age, he will be able to exercise the Order received well; but if before that he should exercise it, he would sin but would not incur irregularity. Dubium 2. Quis, qui Ordinem mala fide suscepit ante aetatem, possit exercere Ordinem postquam aetatem compleverit sine absolutione a suspensione quae incurrit? Sotus, Corduba, and Medina affirm this according to Escob. But more correctly they deny it, Barbosa no. 236 with Bonac. and Diana.

Reason, because a contracted censure is not lifted except through absolution. Dubitatio tertia. Let him incur an irregularity who receives the priesthood before legitimate age? The first opinion affirms what is held by question one, article five, paragraph thirteen and by Barbosa and Sorbo. Reason, because here by celebrating with the Bishop ordaining (as teaches D.), but the second opinion, which is more common and very probable, denies this, and they hold this (16 n. 36).

Diana page 5 translation 10 rule 37. March. item Sair. Avila, 1. c. Ratio 1 quia consecratio illa non censetur actus moraliter distinctus ab ipsa Ordinatione; congruent enim tota Ordi-natio Episcopi a principio usque ad finem est unus actus moralis, ita et ordinati; unde non videtur equum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary. Ipsius una actione morali duplicem incurrat poenam, nempe suspensionem et irregularitatem. Reason 2. because in the cited Extravagant. Pii II. (apud Barbos.

It is alleged (17 n. 11): Thus it is said: Those who are suspended by the execution of their own Orders shall themselves be considered as suspended by law; and if, during such suspension, they presume to minister in the same Orders, they thereby incur the very irregularity. By this word it appears that the Pontiff himself is deemed to incur irregularity, since I

already sustain a tenure of suspension according to moral tenets, as stated in Lib. 514, cap. 514. IV. Treatise. V.

Of the Extreme-Oneness, and Order: let the exercise of the Order have preceded. Moreover, when the Pontiff imposes irregularity on those who presume, it seems least to comprehend this one who is not bound by his own election but by necessity of Ordination to celebrate with the Bishop. They refer, however, from that same source, that such Ordinates are not considered irregular according to the style of the Chancellery, since they themselves are absolved only from suspension. And the same is said by Diana II. cc. with others concerning a Deacon or Subdeacon who, after such a suspension in the same Ordination, chants the Gospel or Epistle. And likewise is it to be said concerning him who incurs suspension when he is ordained by jumping over steps, or outside of proper times, or without the own Bishop's leave, or on the same day receives two sacred Ordinations, or minor Orders together with Subdiaconate; according to what was said above.

That is to say, who incurs irregularity by being ordained before having contracted excommunication? Bonac. affirms in his Treatise on Irregularities, distinction 7, question 3, part 4, number 1, with reference to Navar., and chapter 1: Concerning him who was. But they more probably deny it, the Council says; T. 3, p. 193, with . Reason, because from the aforementioned texts it is not expressly gathered, if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; such a suspension would be irregular, but only if a Confessor be elected as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; let it be suspended; for whose suspension absolution must be sought from the Pope, he says p. 106 with Gibert; understand, if the suspension is public; otherwise it can be absolved by a Bishop according to c. Liceat 6 sess. 24. Three days; Yet all the more does he who receives the sacred Order while suspended or interdicted avoid irregularity; and this constitutes the presumption of Filicu. And likewise for others.

This, however, is to be understood thus: if one so ordained does not exercise the Order in the very ordination, namely, if, for example, some Deacon or Subdeacon approaches the ordination already subjected to some preceding censure, and in this way. He who receives the sacred Order

through ordination and exercises it by chanting an Evangelium or Epistle will not escape irregularity, as correctly says Tourn. d. t. a p. 107 ver. If anyone. Reason, because then already he exercises the Order with prior incurred censure. The same he justly says, Tourn., when proceeding from a Priest who concelebrates with a Bishop against Sair. and Note 3: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood odiously and strictly in respect of ordinary election, but not extraordinary; age should be reckoned not by 600 Baptisms, but by nativity, as can be seen from c. 3 and others; Distinction 77.

See Croix n. 2306. Dubitatur autem 1. Whether someone who has already reached the age required at the evening preceding the day in question can be ordained? They affirm 9. R. 50. ac et March. tum quia minimum pro nihilo reputatur; tum quia dies inceptus in favorabilibus habetur pro completo; tum praesumptum quia vespera et mane moraliter sumuntur pro una die.

But it is more probable that Croix n. 2309 with Navar. and gr. deny this; namely, that for the age of subdeaconate to have begun in the year 22, one who has not truly completed the year 21 cannot at all be said to have reached the year 22. Doubt. 2. Can a day of the bissextile year be excluded in the computation of the age of those ordained? They affirm, c. 5 n. 32, because the year required is understood by itself to be an ordinary year, namely one constant at 365 days. But they more truly deny this, as Bonaventure says in d. 8, q. unic., p. 5, n. 14; and in d. 24, n. 22: For it is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious, strict, and to be understood from the perspective of ordinary election and not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood from the perspective of ordinary election and not extraordinary.

Bishops in no way can dispense from age; nevertheless, it is allowed today by special privilege for Bishops to dispense to a certain time, at least for the benefit of the curate, where there is necessity or utility for the Church. Require. XII. insuier ad suscipiendos Ordines, ut O initium exercuerit prius dinem susceptum in Ecclesia; cui est adscriptus ex 11 et §16 Lib. VI. Treatise.

V. Concerning the Last Unction and Order. 13. But they think that this is not from a grave precept, since the words of the Council are more consultative than preceptive, namely: At in unoquoque Ordine juxta praeceptum Episcopi se exercerant, etc., Requir. XIII. prout præscribit Pontificale, ut Ordinandi Eucharistiam accipiant; sed hoc non sub mortali, ut ait Croix n. 225. cum Dub. 3. Requir.

XIV. probitas vitæ; sed de hac jam locuti sumus in Tract. de Sacram. in gener. ex n. 65. et iterùm mox loquemur agendo de vocatione ad sacrum ministerium. §2 Requir. XV. vocatio divina; de qua, cum sit res tanti momenti undè pendet æterna salus tàm Ordi- nandorum quam populi christiani mirum est si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria et non extraordinaria. Tot Morales Scriptores nullum verbum faciant praeter paucos inter quos fusè et egregiè signanter scripserunt de hoc puncto Habert tom. 7 ex p. 433 et P. Conc. to. 10 ex p. 42. How necessary such a vocation is, is evident from the Saints. By the Fathers, and from the sacred Scriptures themselves, and especially from that passage in the Letter of D. Paul to the Hebrews, chapter 5, verse 4 and 5: "For no one takes on himself the honor, but he is called by God, as was Aaron." Thus also Christ did not glorify Himself to become the Pontiff once only, but He who spoke to Him said: You are My Son.

Wherefore also the Apostles, as though supplying a place for Judas, thus did they pray to God: Thou, Lord, show him whom thou hast chosen. And Himself Christ in John 10:1 and 2 said: He who does not enter the sheepfold through the door, is a thief and a robber; but he who enters through the door, is the shepherd of the sheep; for this reason, any priest is such, since the care of souls is committed to each priest. And again 16. You did not yourselves choose me, but I chose you... that you may bear fruit, and your fruit may remain. Again Lightc. 107. 2 ask... the Lord of the harvest, that he send workers into his harvest.

Therefore, those who are referred to in Chapter II. Doubt. II. On the Sacrament of Orders. 5 19 Those who are not called by God to sacred ministries intrude themselves; these are the ones of whom Jeremiah says (23:21): "I did not send the prophets, and yet they ran about." Of this very class of men, as the Catechism says, there is nothing more unfortunate in comparison with what is more miserable, and nothing more calamitous for the Church; the principal signs of divine calling to the clerical state are indeed these.

I. De genere hujus hominum, ut ait Catechismus, nihil infelicius ad miserius, nihil Ecclesiae calamitosius esse potest. Knowledge suitable [or: convenient], de which we have spoken in no. 790. II. Uprightness of life, of which speaking he says thus in chapter 12: "Let the bishops...know...that I should undertake these orders only with those who are worthy and whose proven life has been one of purity throughout old age; according to that (Wisdom 4:9): The life of old age is an unblemished atlas." Hence the Apostle 1.

Tim. 3 prohibits the ordination of neophytes, that is, as he explains in the same place. Wherefore the same Sacred Doctor in II, 2, qu. 189, art. 1, ad 3 says: The sacred orders presuppose sanctity. And in the Supplement, Question 35, Article 1, Answer 3, he says: For an adequate execution of Ordinances, any kind of goodness is insufficient; rather, excellent goodness is required. Hanc rationem neminem de hoc assignans: ut congruent illi, qui Ordinem suscipiant, super plebem constituantur gradus Ordinis ita et superiores sint merito sanctitatis. Whereby thus he concludes: And so preeminently is given grace which suffices for this, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strictly to be received as regarding ordinary election and not extraordinary, deserves that they be duly numbered among the people of Christ.

That same thing did Saint Denis say before in chapter three concerning the Church. Hierarch.: in divino omni non pudendum aliis ducem fieri, nisi secundum omnem habitum suum factus sit Deformissimus, et Deo simul limus. Quicumque autem habet sanctitatem ordinariam, nec nisi solam gratiam habitualis, non potest quidem dici secundum omnem habitum suum Deo simillimus. Thereby it makes presumptuous that famous saying of St. Aug. [Ambrose]. A certain good monk hardly makes a good cleric.

And that other thing, D. Jerome to Rusticu- s: So live in the monastery, that you may deserve to be a cleric. Wherein it is written by St. 2 in De Sacerdot. c. 2: The integrity of this life (that is to say, for a cleric), if some Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, is for them (not for monks) necessary. III. The mark is a right intention, namely the desire for the enjoyment of divine glory and the salvation of souls, but not (as Doctor Bernard says in his Declamation

on the Gospel). Behold, Lib. 318.

VI: Treatise. V. In seeking honor proper to the extremes and unity, or the repugnance of the body, which are not those of Jesus Christ. 303. Qui autem sine vocatione, talibus signis explorata, in sacrum ministerium se intrudit, non potest quidem à gravi præsumptione excusari. In what manner S. Anselmus (in chapter 5 of his work on Hebrews, regarding that saying of the Apostle, 'For no man taketh this honour unto himself,' etc.) speaks about this: For he who thrusts himself in and seeks his own glory commits a robbery against the grace of God, and therefore does not receive blessing but cursing.

And this reason is disclosed if someone be chosen as Confessor by way of supplement, and may be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be interpreted from the election ordinaria and not extraordinaria. This teaches D. 4 where: Those whom God elects for something He prepares and disposes them that they may do it; if someone be chosen as Confessor by way of supplement, and may be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be interpreted from the election ordinaria and not extraordinaria. Those who are found fit according to 2 Cor. 3. Our sufficiency is from God Who made us fit ministers of the new testament. Therefore he who is not chosen by God but who himself imposes upon himself will not be an apt minister; hence wisely it is said by Habert in cap. 1 §2: "If a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, another triennium can well confirm him after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, teaches D.4 ubi: 'Those whom God selects for something He so prepares and disposes that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, another triennium can well confirm him after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, those who are thus selected, may we find them fit, according to 2 Cor. 3: Our sufficiency is from God who has made us ministers of the new testament.' Hence he: '(Without much difficulty he will be unable to care for his salvation; he will remain in the body of the Church, like a limb moved in another's place; if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, another triennium can well confirm him after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, those who are thus selected, may we find them

fit, according to 2 Cor. 3: Our sufficiency is from God who has made us ministers of the new testament.' Hence he: '(He will be able to serve, but with deformity).' Whereupon it concludes: '(Although absolutely speaking salvation can be obtained, difficult ways must nevertheless be traversed and a middle path in salvation will be apprehended)'." Since however by this he exposes himself to a great danger of damnation, I know not how his grave fault is excused. Who knowing (says the most learned Bishop Abelly in 4), without any reason of divine vocation, intruded himself into the Priesthood, would undoubtedly have placed himself in an open boundary of salvation by sinning specifically against the Holy Spirit; and if a Confessor be elected for supplement, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary one., that is: (such indeed a sin we rarely or almost never say is remitted from the Gospel). Hence, to this discrimination more than others are committed those bishops who promote to sacred Orders those not called thereunto, by that very Apostle (1 Tim. 22): "Neither didst thou give commandment to be taught by the sins of others." Explaining those words, S.: Leo in Epistola 1 (otherwise known as 87) ad Africanum 2 wrote: What is it to communicate alien sins, unless you make such an ordainer as that which is mentioned in Chapter II?

Dub. II. Of the Sacrament, diligently investigate and examine. For it is prescribed in canonical law, and specifically in chapter Nullus of distinctorum 24, that no one be ordained unless he has been approved. Whereupon wisely observed D. Bernard that orders are to be admitted only for those who have been proven, not for those who are still being examined.

For this very probation to be sought from the Bishop is not indeed sufficient, if a Confessor is chosen merely as an addition, it can nevertheless be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period should be understood with odious strictness concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary, since he himself will know nothing amiss about the ordinand; but he must be certain of his positive probity according to the sublimity of the grade to which that person aspires; just as commonly they say Sotus 4. Holy. Distantia xxv. quaest. i. numquam tamen. Salm, de tit: n. 46 et fusius Habert, 4 ad 3 ubi dict: Ad minus (idest non solum, ut bene explicat Glossa) hoc requiritur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de

electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Nesciat Ordinans aliquid notrarium sanctitatis in Ordinando esse, sed praesumptum exigitur amplius, ut secundum mensura Ordinis vel officii injungiendi, diligentior cura opponatur, ut habentur certitudine de qualitate promovendorum, sollem ex testimonio alteram. The quality to be promoted is that which the same Sacred Doctor expressed in 2 Aquinas 189 a. 1 ad 3 where he said: Ordinations of sacred persons require special sanctity... whence the weight of ordinations should be imposed through a portion of desiccating sanctity (namely as he adds) by drying off from the humor of vices.

And N. SS. P. Bened. XIV. In the Bull Ubi Primum, most wisely thus addressing the Bishops: It is to be studied diligently and with great care by you whether those who have undertaken the ministries of their predecessors have had such a mode of life and progress in sacred sciences as truly renders them worthy of judging, upon which it might be said, ascend higher; for otherwise it would be more expedient to leave some in a lower rank rather than to elevate others to a higher position with greater danger to themselves and the scandal of others. Speaking with presumptuous proof according to the text at Psalm 16, in Timothy, it is said: What is this haste? Not from book 520.

VI. Treatise. V. Of the Last Unction and Order: in the first proof neither the second nor the third is imposed, but where prolonged consideration has preceded, then the most exact discussion is set forth, thereupon the great imposition. Neither does that matter when it is broken; you too will lay down what he has sinned, who have given presumptuously the wounded and suffered wrongs of those preceding.

On this matter regarding Bishops in this probation: they should not content themselves with simple attestation from Parish Priests who, influenced by human considerations, easily concede attestations of this kind to Clerics, lest thereby they attract the enmity of those very ones and their near relations; but, in addition, it must be ascertained with certain evidence from others worthy of credit through secret information, not only if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, but it can also be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted in matters of ordinary election and not extraordinary, did not render him unfittingly good, namely if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can also be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted in matters of ordinary election and not extraordinary. If he lives

spiritually, is assiduous in Churches, frequents Sacraments and Prayer, lives separated from secular affairs, associates with well-behaved companions, devotes himself to study, uses modesty in dress, etc. If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can also be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted in matters of ordinary election and not extraordinary. If Prelates know that some Cleric has been publicly implicated in some notorious scandal, then it will not suffice to demand common probation from him, but the experience of many years will be needed to confirm his amendment; indeed, he should fear at that time lest he affect piety so as to reach Orders where, upon entrance thereunto, he will revert to his former depravity. Someone will say: If this were observed, ministers would certainly fail in the Church. He rightly responds to this the same Benedict. XIV. In the aforementioned Bull, concerning whether absolution from the Confessional should always be denied to a cleric habituated in an infamous vice who desires to ascend to sacred orders without prior experiential test of continence? See number 63. §04 Si autem vocatio divina necessaria est ad Sacerdotium, magis erit necessaria ad officia Episcoporum et Parochorum, de quibus loquens Dominus Thomas in secunda Secundae quaestio 185 articulus 1 dict: appetere... Episcopatum ratione,... circumstantium bonorum... est illicitum... ad celsitudinem... gradus appetere Episcopatum est praesumptuosum... sed appetere proximis prodesse, est secundum se laudabile.

But because, inasmuch as it is an Episcopal act, it has annexed to it a grade of dignity; and if someone should be chosen as Confessor for supplementation, it seems presumptuous, but may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary, if someone should be chosen as Confessor for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary, it profits the subjects unless there be imminent manifest necessity. That was confirmed by N. SS. P. Bened. XIV. In the Bull issued most recently on the 12th day of April, 1753, which begins: "Incylym, saying: No one ought to be ignorant that the desire itself not to be immune from the guilt of sin is not a laudable aspiration for the episcopate, because although any desire to assist others is commendable, yet this assistance cannot be given without the sublimity of the episcopate, and it most likely originates from

an innate vice of presumption. 'You ask what are the duties of ordinands?" Response.

I. It is the duty of doorkeepers to guard the keys of the temple, to open and shut its doors; to forbid those whom it does not concern to interest themselves in sacred matters; to ring the bells; to watch over those who have entered the Church; to open the book for him who preaches. II. Ostiarii est claves templi servare, apere, et claudere ejus januas; arcere eos, quibus non licet interesse sacris; campanas pulsare; quae intrant Ecclesiam, custodire; ei, qui praedicat, aperire librum. The duty of the reader is to read in church the lessons from the old and new Testament: likewise to teach the rudiments of Christian faith to catechumens. » Item panem et novos fructus benedicere.

Not however to preach, but to lay on hands above those tormented by unclean spirits, in order to adjure and cast them out; likewise to exorcize catechumens. They hold: and therefore only these can solemnly exercise that. See what is said in 1.3 of *IV*: The office of an Acolyte is to prepare ampullas of wine and water for the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to hand them over to the Subdeacon; also to bring tapers to the same sacrifice, and to minister to him, whence he is called Cæoferarius. V. The office of Subdiacon is immediately subordinate to the Diaconate in regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass, bringing the chalice. §2a Lib.

VI. Treatise. V. Of the Last Unity, and Order. and to give it to him an open vessel with water prepared, to pour water for washing his hands, the epistle from official duty, and solemnly to read in Mass: *. According to the Pontifical, heretical corporal and purificators are to be destroyed *. VI.

The ministry of a deacon is to chant solemnly the Gospel in Mass, immediately minister to the Priest in all things pertaining to the sacrifice of the Mass, vest the altar, bear the Cross, and finally, according to the commission of the Priest, preach and baptize. * (Provided now just reason, namely, if there lacks a Priest who ministers conveniently, as the Doctors commonly say when alighted from. *) Que hoc ita. In case however of extreme necessity, namely if another Priest is absent, the Deacon can and is bound to minister Viaticum without the commission of the Presbyter; this also is commonly agreed upon. DD. in the same place. And the same holds true in the administration of Baptism; see for reference.

Sure. Translated: » Certum.

The deacon, however, solemnly ministering Baptism or Eucharist without commission, incurs irregularity; see d. num. 116. v. *) VII. It is the duty of presbyters to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass, absolve from sins, baptize, bless water, and perform similar actions, to teach the people in doctrine, and to pasture them by example. See Escob. E. 8 t. 7 c. 1. There are, however, four principal obligations for those promoted to higher Orders, namely: Reciting Canonical Hours.

The Observance of Celibacy. 3. Having a Title, namely, of poverty, of benefice, or of patrimony, whereby they are ordained. 4. The deferring of the habit and tonsure. From the first obligation of Divine Office, we have already disposed. It remains to treat here of the second, third, and fourth. § I. Of the obligation of Celibacy. §06 How shall this obligation be proven? 807 Q. 1. Whether it itself be of divine law? 808 Q. 2.

Whether it is from an ecclesiastical precept, or from a vow. Doubt. II. On the Sacrament of Orders. 89g Dub. 1. An ignorant one be held bound to chastity by such a vow.

Who would be bound to chastity by a vow expressedly refused? 810 What if someone has been ordained before the use of reason? And what if before puberty? 811 What if he is ordained out of fear? 812 Questio 3. How, being married in a constant marriage, can one be ordained in the Sacraments? Dubium 1. Is the wife of such a marriage bound to profess the Religion? Dub. 2.

Can such a wife be permitted to marry? The obligation of perpetual celibacy is held to inhere in those who ascend to sacred orders, and especially in canon 1 de 28, where it is stated: "Bishops must not presume to ordain subdeacons unless they have previously promised to live chastely; for no one should approach the ministry of the altar whose chastity has not been proved by previous ministerial service." And in canon 9 thus defined is it stated: If anyone says that clerics constituted in sacred orders or regulars who have solemnly professed chastity are able to contract marriage and for that reason a valid contract can be, notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law or vow.... let him be anathema. Hence it is concluded that if someone be chosen as Confessor for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not to extraordinary one; through such a vow, an indissoluble marriage contract after the vow may be rendered invalid according to c. un. de Voto et voti red. in 6. If, however, a marriage has been anteriorly contracted, ordination can render

it, but not seek to annul it. And moreover, wheresoever he violates chastity, there he will also commit a sacrilege.

See Question 1. Is hoc义务 Aflir-807 mant Major, Valdensis, etc., apud et probabile putat . (præciso voto) non esse de jure divino, sed tan-tùm ecclesiastico, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. ministri ordinati in sacris obligentur ad castitatem, vel ab Ecclesia, vel per votum Ordinibus annexum; et ideò rectè in hac obli-gatione potest Ecclesia cum eis dispensare. Thus S. Th. 2. 2 q. 88 art. 11. c. 6 n. 11., who gives many such examples ad Lib. 524. VI.

Treatise. V. Of the Extreme Unction, and it is introduced and established, so that it may be apparent from the very words 608 Question 2. Whether this obligation be immediately from the precept of the Church, or mediately through the vow of ordinands? Both are probable from the same chapter 9 and Scot chapter 6 note 28. (who says that when a Confessor is chosen for supplementarily, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Not from vow, but from the sole law of the Church ordered into sacred orders are they bound by chastity; furthermore, since the Church herself could properly bind sacred ministers to observe chastity, why should it be said that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementarily, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary? Moreover, since the Church herself could properly bind sacred ministers to observe chastity, why does she add that if a votive connection with sacred orders has been desired, while this is not expressed in law?)

Because if the obligation to celibacy were from a vow, it would follow that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he might well be confirmed for another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, because it is odious and strictly to be taken in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary, because those who such a vow invincibly ignore, or who explicitly do not wish to relinquish that vow, would not be bound thereby to chastity; if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he might well be confirmed for another three years after the time of the supplement, since

the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, because it is odious and strictly to be taken in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. It would indeed be absurd and pernicious. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessary is chosen for a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessary beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, accords with this sentiment: If a Priest were to sin against chastity, he would commit only one sin against chastity; since the law of the Church, being already prohibited by natural right concerning the same matter, does not multiply the species of sin; just as theft forbidden by natural law does not have malice or wickedness if forbidden by human law; and this is contrary to common doctrine which teaches that those ordained in Sacred Orders, offending chastity, even commit the sin of sacrilege. For rightly do Aversa respond: and if a Confessor be chosen for supplément, he may properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplément, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly accepted in ordinary election, not in extraordinary; that is to say, if a Confessor be chosen for supplément, he may properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplément, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly accepted in ordinary election, not in extraordinary. For then a human precept would be multiplied in species; for when to a natural precept an addition is made from a different motive, there arises a double malice in the cleric: one against justice from the law of nature, and another against religion from the ecclesiastical law, which prohibits injury to a person devoted to God on account of the motive of religion. Wherefore undoubtedly the Priest commits sacrilege by violating chastity, because the Church, out of the motive of Religion, imposes upon its ministers observance of chastity out of reverence for the sacred Order. A religious priest, however, if he sins against chastity, commits besides the sin against chastity but one sacrilegious sin; because he offends the same virtue of religion and not another, as they well note when Sacred Doctrine deems the judgment more probable and more common, agreeing with S. Th. 2. 2 q. 88 art. 11, which Beller. t. 1 de . tit. 1. 7 follows.

Pontius 1. 7 c. 27 n. 7 cum n. 476 et Soto tenet, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Oblatio castitatis non oriatur immediatè ex lege Ecclesiae sed ex voto. Si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio

de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. In ipsa facto Ordinationis emittitur. Firstly, because this is already expressed in the law, and precisely in the chapter Cum olim, de Clericis conjug., where it says: Therefore not attending to this, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can indeed be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received regarding the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one. The Oriental Church has not admitted continence by vow. Therefore, in the Western Church, or Latin Church, continence by vow is already admitted. Secondly, because, if the obligation of chastity were entirely from Church law, the Pontiff could absolve all presumptuous priests from it; but this would be against the common judgment of the Doctors, who only allow the Pontiff to dispense in cases of utmost urgency, so that he may act with the ministers alone, as stated shortly in n. 807, but not with priests. But it is doubted whether he who invincibly ignores the vow annexed to that order would be held to keep chastity according to canon 809? Canon 6, n. 33 says: this is to be held according to common consent.

DD., vel ex vi voti impliciti; ut ipsi sentiunt cum S. Th. et VI par. 2 n. 2162. cum secus verò, si ignorantia fuisset culpabilis; vel si quis Ordinem in-526 Lib. VI. Treatise. Five. With respect to Extreme Unction and Order, it extended itself to receive with the same obligation as others do receive, as is stated in the aforementioned text from section 3 note 201.

What? I. Doubt. Whether the Order would be bound to chastity if it expressly did not wish to vow chastity? Philip thinks that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; which, if a Confessor should be chosen for the supplement, can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. This would be presumptuously held from vow: this seems rather improbable. They, however, think that when a Dicastery says if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be suitably confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, given its odiousness and strict interpretation for ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones, it would be presumed from his vow; this seems rather improbable. Moreover, they say if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement,

he can be suitably confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, given its odiousness and strict interpretation for ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones, such that if someone should sin against chastity without committing sacrilege; but this last point is not true unless a Confessor chosen as a supplement can be suitably confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, given its odiousness and strict interpretation for ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones, such that if someone should sin against chastity it would not commit sacrilege; but this last point is not true neither, nor sufficiently probable, and is contrary to common opinion, so that they themselves are deceived. n. 28.

Hence it is more probable that Duns Scotus and others hold with 7 D. 27 n. 12., and with D. 268 n. 102. together with Amico, Mayr, etc.: if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For in such a case he is bound by chastity, not from vow, but from ecclesiastical precept, which, for reasons of religion (as we have said), compels him, lacking vow, to observe chastity? It must be noted, however, that it is certain. if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, he can be confirmed for another triennium after the term supplementi, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones.,that is, if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it is certain that he can be confirmed for another triennium after the term supplementi, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. He who is ordained before the use of reason, although the ordination is valid (as has been proved n. 782., with . un. De Clerico per saltum etc.) non debet iam teneri ad castitatem; unde legitime et validiter potest intrare in Matrimonium. Thus Croix n. 2161. and c. 6 n. 42. Cum autem teneatur ad castitatem qui post usum rationis sed ante pubertatem ordinatur? They affirm that the Pontiff in the seventh book concerning Bonaventure, in the same title question three part nine number nine, and since by reason of natural law there is already due the obligation to observe this vow; conversely, no such canonical right exists to invalidate this vow.

This is indeed probable; however, they do not deny it improbably. l. 7 D. 3 n. 8. c. 6 n. 43. cum All. 15. n. 4. cum Soto, et Henr. Reason because such

a vow constituted man in an irrevocable state, in which the Pontiff never or rarely dispenses; hence such a vow eagerly prompts the mature and perfect use of reason. The same is said of him who is validly ordained, or on account of a defect in form; or in matter or intention, that is, if anyone were ordained by violence or fear, without having any mind to receive ordination, as stated in Croix n. 2163 with the common understanding. (And this must be noted: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may well be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, as it is odious and strictly to be understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary, does not oblige one to chastity nor hold one bound to divine service; as stated in l. 4 n. 144 v.) It is asked.) Nevertheless, in dubium praesumendum est prova-lore Ordinationis, ut Croix n. 2203 et 2230. But it is doubtful whether he is bound to chastity who is ordained out of fear of a grave danger, but with the intention of receiving orders.

Pontius dematr. l. 7 c. 29 ac S. Antoninus; Sot. dicunt teneri; de nec à Papa dispensetur; quia metus minuit, non vero tollit voluntarium. At probabilins l. 7. Bonac. cil. q. 3 part. 2 n. r4. cum ac cum Vide) Ratio, quia jam ex probabiliari sententia, ut soprà, ordinati non tenentur ad castitatem, nisi ex voto, et verius est, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. votum metu gravi extortum irritum sit, ex c. Cum dilectus, de iis, qui vi etc. Vide dicta l. 3 n. 197. v. But what. These things are nevertheless limited: that is, let him know and be aware, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be duly confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and to be strictly accepted for ordinary election but not for extraordinary, should subject him to such an obligation by virtue of such an act.

Moreover, it has been consulted that such metu ordinati should seek dispensation, which the Sacred Congregation has repeatedly granted where a solid fear has been duly approved, as is referred to by P. Zacharia in Croix, l. 6 part. 2 ad n. 2163. What if the fear were justly inflicted, for example, when the Bishop constrained someone by fear to accept orders due to scarcity of ministers? They think it probable that D. 19 n. 8 and Dict. ex: do not consider this bound by a vow of chastity; because probably (as they say) fear, whether just or unjust, whether grave or light, always irritates §18 Lib. VI. Treatise.

V. Of the Last Unction and Order... vow. But rather they themselves hold the opposite, c. et., when it is said to Dictio and Philibert, because in that case he would be irrationally unwilling; and therefore fear-vow does not irritate, nor does it make congruent or presumptuous the Matrimonium, according to what is said in S12 Question 3. When, however, a person who is joined in a constant Marriage may be initiated into the Sacred Orders? It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, without permission from the spouse it will not be permitted to receive sacred Orders or to presume the first tonsure, according to a: ult. de Temp. ord. in VI et in.

Without the context, the abbreviation "Extrav." appears to be a Latin term that can have multiple meanings depending on its usage. Given the scholastic and theological context, it is most likely referring to "ex usu" which means "from use." Translation: From use. Ancient vows.

Nevertheless, irregularity is imposed on him who is ordained in the Sacraments without divine permission or legitimate divorce, even if the Marriage had not been consummated; because this is only resolved by the profession of Religion, and not through Ordination, as stated in the same context. Extraordinary. It is probable however that if a penitent should be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, is to be understood concerning an ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a penitent should be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, is to be understood concerning an ordinary election, not extraordinary. For after Marriage only he would be ordained in Sacred Orders, not required to proceed with Profession of Religion, so that they may say it. S. Antonius. Quia magis incumbet, est esse Religionem profiteri quam solummodo ad se restrictum in castitatem se subducere. But licitly a married man may be promoted to sacred orders by reason of his wife’s permission, provided he himself vow chastity, as is stated in c. 14 of the Decretals on Married Conversations.

And provided that the license be expressed and entirely spontaneous; as stated in cap. Consaluit, same title. But here there is doubt i. In this case: Is the wife bound beyond her vow to fulfill the Religion? They affirm. D.

30 n. 6. et cum 6 i c. 25 n. 7. 4 R. 129 et Hurt. ex Idque clare probatur ex cit. c. Conjugatus, ubi dicitur: Nullus conjugatorum est ad sacros Ordines promovendus; nisi ab uxore continentiam profectione absolutus fuerit.

It is not said that he who profits from Religion should be promoted to sacred Orders; rather, he who provides continence should be: yet if a man is admitted to the Episcopate, then his wife must absolutely enter Religion, as it is established; Indeed, VI de Conventualibus conjugio. Receive a man that he may become religious, and let his wife be a youth; as it is said in ch. Cum sis 4 idem titulus, where it is thus stated: Let us prefer not to permit a passage for a man or a woman unless both have migrated to Religion. Now, si id uxor senex est, et sterilis, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. sine suspectione possit esse in saeculo, dissimulare poteris ut ea in saeculo remanente et castitatem promittente ad Religionem transeat vir ejusdem. Dubit. 2. If a woman promoted to sacred orders by this man should have emitted a simple vow of chastity, does she validly contract Matrimony after the death of her husband?

The first opinion denies this, and this is held by them. 1. 7 d. 40 n. 2. Mazzotta t. 4 p 213 et cum commune ut asserunt, ex c. Quia sunt, 10 d. 28 ubi loquens Dominus : Qui male sociati sunt, disjungantur. And the same is said in Et ratio est, quia Ecclesia ob reverentiam Ordinis à praemo viro assumpti, et ob licentiam uxoris voventis, reddit eam inhabilem ad subsequens conjugium. This sentence is indeed more common and very probable; yet it is sufficiently probable that the second opinion is presumed, according to 7 q. 5 a. 3 S. ad 2 et P. 1. 7 c. 25 n. 10, which state that the aforementioned marriage is valid; for although in the aforementioned texts separation of spouses is prescribed as a penalty for contracting a second marriage, it is not declared to be null and void; much more so, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is in the case of ordinary election, rather than extraordinary one. This penalty of separation is imposed on other crimes according to law (as Pontius proves c. 20 n. 6); yet if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is in the case of ordinary election, rather than extraordinary one. This penalty of separation is imposed on other crimes according to law (as Pontius proves c. 20 n. 6). Marriage may be null.

Nam et vir, qui ex justa causa perpetuum fecit divortium ab uxore, possit eà inscia vel invita Ordo sacros suscipere? If in common discourse we were to say that when a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be adequately confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, so far as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, then it might indeed be. § II. On the obligation of holding a Title. Penalty for those in contravention. On the Titulus Paupertatis. Chapter 330 of the Book. VI. Treatise.

V. On the Last Unction and Order. 315 Concerning the title according to whose diocese the sufficiency of the Benefit is to be derived from the tax rate? Note. 2. What if the deficit is slight? Not. 3.

What would come under the name of Benefice? Or is it the stipend of Masses? And would a Benefice suffice from the future on? Regarding the Title of Patrimony. I. Can anyone be ordained under the title of his own industry? 319 Qu. II. May a father be obligated to assign property to a willing son for ordination? 320 Qu.

III. Is one subject to suspension who is ordained without a title? 321 Doubt 1. Who is ordained with a fictitious heritage? 322 Dub. 2. Does one incur a suspension who is ordained on the security given for the return of that which was donated? 323 Dub. 3. Whether he who is ordained after a fictitious patrimony renounces that given donation? 324 Dub. 4.

Can an ordained person renounce his patrimony if he has sustenance from elsewhere? The bishop who ordains or grants dismission is bound to provide for him otherwise, until he has the title; according to c. Cum secundum: "But if the Bishop has remitted the matter to examiners, and they in bad faith have approved the title, they are bound proportionately to provide for the sustenance of the one ordained; but if they do not have from whence they can provide aliment, an action is granted against the Bishop," as the Gloss says in d. c. Cum secundum. Moreover, if holy orders be conferred by divers bishops, each bishop who has ordained is bound to provide maintenance in proportion, according to c. 4. Of providing. However, the Bishop (or others as mentioned above) is bound to nothing [if], I. if, with due diligence already exercised, he has taken care that the Patrimony be genuine, and such a case be one of distraction or fictitious discovery.

II. Si clericus possit aliunde vivere, praesumptum ex suis honestis laboribus, vel si habeat patrem divitem, quia pater ex jure naturali tenetur filium alere; Deinde hic notandum est: si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; si titulus quo suscepit Subdiaconatum casu pereat, non possit is ad superiorem Ordinem ascendere sine novo titulo: Croix n. 2284 cum. Title however can be either sustenance of poverty or sufficiency, namely Benefice or Patrimony, of which here is to be treated individually. And as regards the title of paupertas: this title is ordained for Regulars alone, and not for Novices, who are subject to Constitutio 75. Saint Paul V. Romanus, non possunt Sacros Ordines suscipere sub poena suspensionis, nisi Monimentium habeant, exceptis Religiosis Societatibus.

Jesus, qui post vota simplicia ordinari possunt: et si inde Religione ejiciantur, teneri Superiores eos alere, usque dum habeant unde vivant, dict Philib. apud C. Sed Croix absolutely this negat n. 2288 et n. 2106 referens plures alias Declarat. S. C. to the contrary. However P. Zacharia according to Croix adds to the aforementioned n. 2106, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Bened. Thirteen.

By his own initiative, issued in the year 1724 on the 14th day of February. As regards the title of Benefice, above all this final Decree concerning it is found from 1724: When it does not become those who are attached by divine ministry to avoid the disgrace of their order by begging... and it has been ascertained that many in various places are admitted with little or no pleasure into sacred Orders, who shape themselves a benefice of the Church through diverse arts and tricks, or presume to obtain suitable faculties: the Sacred Synod decreed that henceforth no secular cleric, even if he be otherwise suitable by extraordinary merit, should be promoted to sacred Orders unless it is first ascertained legally that he has a sufficient ecclesiastical benefice; and if someone be chosen as Confessor for supplementation, then his consecration may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious, strict, and to be received as such in ordinary elections and not in extraordinary ones. If anyone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, then his consecration may also well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition

against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious, strict, and to be received as such in ordinary elections and not in extraordinary ones, should someone have sufficient honest means by which he can support himself with honor and peacefully possess. That Benefice, however, cannot be resigned unless mention is made, if any Confessor be chosen by supplement, he may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it is to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if any Confessor be chosen by supplement, he may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it is to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. According to that Book 352. VI. Treatise.

V. On the Extreme Unction and Order. Let the promotion be made title to a benefice; nor let the resignation be accepted, unless a confirmation can be properly obtained through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, like the strict and odious acceptance of an ordinary election, not considered for extraordinary elections. For if anyone is chosen as Confessor for the supplement, a proper confirmation might be achieved through another triennium following the term of supplement, since the prohibition on not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary and not extraordinary elections; from elsewhere he can live commodiously, and otherwise arranged resignation will amount to nothing. The true patrimony or pension obtained by a cleric henceforth cannot be possessed, unless those whom the Bishop shall judge to be necessary for the need or convenience of his churches; and this first being seen, that such patrimony or pension is truly obtained by them, sufficient for their sustenance in life, thereafter neither can that patrimony or pension be alienated, or extinguished, or remitted without the license of the Bishop, until a competent ecclesiastical benefice is acquired, or otherwise they have some means wherewith to live, whereupon the penalties decreed by ancient Canons may accrue upon innovations of this kind. Note 1. To be drawn at the rate of the Diocese where the Benefice is, if it requires perpetual residence; but if not, according to the rate of origin, as declared multiple times by the Sacred Congregation in the years 1701, 1708, and 1713 according to Benedict.

XIV. de in Constit. The ministry of the Apostles, which was thereafter confirmed and extended throughout the whole world by Blessed [one]. XIII. Note 2. If any Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be

adequately confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary; if the defect of Benefice is moderate, lawfully he can be ordained; otherwise, if notable, let it be noted. R. 52 cum Not. 3. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., nomen Beneficii possit praesumendum aliquis ordinari ad titulum Coadjutorie perpetue, ut.

Ita 1. c. n. 24 Campanile; et hoc praesumptum i Offi- iatura, aut Capellania illa sit amovibilis, dummodo qui habet jus nominandi, obli- getur, ut non removeat ordinatum, usquedum hic sibi proeuret Beneficium aut Patrimonium, ut sapienter advertit Bened. XIV. But remuneration for masses or alms do not suffice as a title, since they are uncertain, unless perhaps these commonly occur sufficiently for sustenance, as Philib. says at n. 69 in fine; see also what is said at n. 774. The title of the Episcopal table is insufficient unless there be the consent of the Chapter, even if it be tacit; namely, if knowing it, he does not contradict it, as Croix n. 2271 proves from practice. Question Nonewhether anyone can be ordained with the title of Benefice with certainty regarding the future?

They affirm, Sayr.: n. 70, and admit: Sed verius negant. 1. c., quia quare hoc ordinari nequit, etiamsi injuste impediatur a possessione. Si autem quis possidet Beneficium sed reditus exigi non potest, usque dum fiat Sacerdos bene posset ordinari Subdiaconum et Diaconum. Thus also Garc. III. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. This pertains to the title of Patrimony; according to this 817th title from session 21 c. 2, not all can be ordained, but only those whom the Bishop has judged suitable (Tridentine words) for necessity, or conveniently for his churches.

The patrimony however should be upon certain things, and immovable, as from its nature it is. fruitful by peace in possession, neither alienated by another's money, nor burdened with a mortgage or hypothec; yet Hinc is not sufficient if anyone presumptuously promises writing to ordain

provisions, although a perpetual census redeemable suffices, because this of itself bears fruit; provided the Bishop uses caution so that if it be redeemed it may apply to another purchase, as Croix notes. That very thing thus admits a presumptuous Bened. XIV. and with the Decision of the Roman Railway. The presumptuous one suffices if anyone from his own 334 Book. VI.

Treatise. V. Regarding the Extreme Unction, and as regards if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not extraordinary, is admitted in the case where there would be urgency due to the scarcity of Priests. But it is admitted by Bened. XIV. 1. c. n. 16. ex Decr.

The Sacred College likewise also when a cleric is appointed for the necessity or convenience of the Church. Addit Gob. ibidem, sufficit ut aliquis Comes aut Communitas obliget sua bona ad Clericum alendum: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Valde proba- bile mihi videtur, saltem quòad Communitatem, sicùt et aliis, quos consului, visum est (etsi Croix loc. cit. oppositum probabilius vocet). Tridentinum enim nequaquam limitat, ut Patrimonium super re stabili constituatur; tantùm praescribit d. sess. 21 c. 2 si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Debeat esse verum et sufficiens ad Clericum sustentandum, quia Concilium id præcipuè cavere intendit, ne Ecclesiae ministri ob inopiam emendicare cogantur. Therefore, it will be more obligated for some community to guard this than to assign some stable thing, because this can easily fail, whereas any entire community cannot. Notandum verò, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo

Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. in Concordato nostri Regni statutum sit, non posse in posterum Patrimonium constitui, nisi unicè super bonis immobilibus; aut super annuis reditibus fixis. See the words of the Concordat below at n. 83o at the end.

The patrimony is reckoned in lieu of legitimate, unless otherwise expressly stated contrary to the will 313 Question NoneI. Whoever can be ordained without Patrimonium, but rather through the title of his industry; for example, if he is a Painter, Master of Games, or some other profession? Gonz. affirm that then a prudent judgment is made, whereby it is not deemed lacking to him what will be fitting, according to the mind of 66. And concerning this Blessed [or Saint].

XIV. S. C. et signanter unam emapatam mense octob. 1589 in qua dictum fuit; Si quis tantùm habeat, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Ex in- Austria vel honesto labore lucratur, puta si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod sit Musi- cus, Magister Grammaticae, Pictor, Scriptor, aut al- terius professionis, non potest promoveri, et iomsi id sit sufficientes ad sustentationem vitae. Item die 23 maji 1609. The Sacred Congregation responded: The degree of Doctorate, whether in Theology or Canon Law is not a title to which one can be promoted to sacred Orders; but it is absolutely required either a Benefice or Patrimony sufficient for honestly sustaining life and promoting it. Reason, because in what words he excludes all hope of acquisition for the future, since this hope can perish through infirmity or some other accident.

Question. II. An, si filius invito parente vellet sacerdocium suscipere, teneretur pater illi patrimonium assignare? It must be affirmed with the words of book 4, question 26, note 4. chapter 6, note 87. Philib. etc Imo

hie dicunt, ad hoc cogi posse Judicem Ecclesiasticum; pari modo ac pater cogi potest ad assignandam dotem filiae, quae dignum matrimonium contractit vel qua cupit religionem ingressum, ut dicit Lopez, et Adven. apud .

Question None. III. He incurs the penalty of suspension who is ordained without means, or benefit? The first judgment denies with Article 7, Number 6. March. et n. 366 cum .

They consider this judgment rightly sufficiently probable and a suspension itself from the exercise of the Order is imposed upon those who are ordained with a fictitious title: nevertheless according to the chapter Cum secundum. Concerning the prebend. Innoc. III. He has changed this penalty from an obligation upon the ordained to an obligation on the ordainer to provide for him, so that there not be lacking to him §36 Lib. VI.

Treatise. V. On the Last Unction and Order, they glossate and say: d. n. 366 affords a declaration. The Sacred Congregation published it in the year 1583 (which Barbosa, Garcia, and others refer to), where it was thus stated: Ordained against the form of this Decree (that is, the Council) without Benefit or patrimony, he is not thereby suspended, nor does he incur any penalty; but he who ordains him is bound to provide for it, according to chapter Two of Apostolicae Praebendae, which alone is innovated by the Council, and no other. Nor does the Bull of St. Pius V interfere.

Romanus, edita 14 octob. 1568, ut opponit idemque dictum fuit de Clericis in communi viventibus. Nam hoc specialiter est decreto datum pro his et non ad alios extendendum. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary; yet morally one sins who thus ordains, not revoking it into doubt, as rightly he says. c. Secunda tamen sententia probabilior, quam tenent d. 3i sect. i n. 35. 1: 7 e. i dub. 35 n. 12. Bonac. qu. d. 8 unic. p. 5 num. 24 et Concilium enim dixit: Penas antiquorum Canonum super his innovando. He spoke innovating; therefore presumptuously he revoked the revoked penalties and renewed them.

He said penances, not punishment; therefore he understood not only the penance of the ordainer, but also the presumed ordination to be renewed. He said the Canons, therefore he innovated the penalties not only of the

Canons of Innocence III but of all; and thus he added those of the ancients. Nevertheless, when it is said that what, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being, as odious and strict as it is for the election ordinarily made, should likewise be understood strictly even for an extraordinary election; although in these Canons possession is not required if one were to be ordained with that title but without such possession — nevertheless, he who sins against the Tridentine precept would indeed commit a mortal sin, but would not incur suspension. They advert to II: if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received for ordinary election and not for extraordinary, requires that ancient custom did not demand a sufficient title for sustaining the seminary, but any sufficient title would suffice, according to what is said there. But it must be adverted III: if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received for ordinary election and not for extraordinary, requires that ancient custom did not demand a sufficient title for sustaining the seminary, but any sufficient title would suffice, according to what is said there; moreover, at the Naples Decennial Synod, a suspension itself is imposed by fact, reserved to the Archbishop, upon those who receive their first tonsure with an assumed title; and all who are present at it incur the same reservation of excommunication by fact. But according to this second opinion, namely, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received in regard to ordinary, not extraordinary election; moreover, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received in regard to ordinary, not extraordinary election. Therefore, one who is ordained without patrimony incurs suspension; but whether any incur it in any places except Naples, those who are ordained with assumed patrimony incur it?

First sentence, quam tenent et Avila, item Palaus, Diana; dicitur autem, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de

electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; quando quis ordinatur cum patrimonio facto, jam externè de ipsa constet: ideo, quamvis hic peccet in quantum facit testimonia jurare falsum, tamen non incurrit suspensionem. The second sentence affirms; and set forth as a true sentence as above, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. incurrat suspensionem ordinatus sine patrimonio, hanc sequendam censeo cum . de Bonac. l. c. p. 5 n. 21 Barbosa c. 6 n. 78 qui eam certam vo- cant cum Fagn. n. 65. These indeed say, if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary; that is, if any Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. He who is ordained with made-over patrimony does not merely sin by making perjurers swear falsely, and by deceiving the Churches; but he incurs suspension. Reason, because he who is ordained with a made-up patrimony, truly is ordained without patrimony, according to the mind of the Council and Canons, which required a title so that a cleric might not be compelled to amend it; and therefore the Council said, unless previously it has been legally established, etc., this legitimate signifies rightly the presumed documents of the title to be legitimate. Another reason is required, because when someone is ordained without property, he is truly ordained without property according to the mind of the Council and the Canons, which required a title so that a cleric would not be forced to amend; and therefore the Council said unless it first be rightly established, etc., this legitimate signifies what legitimized documents the title should be.

VI. Treatise. V. Regarding the Extrema-Unction and Ordinamation, the Bishop is bound to order him to be nourished, but he is not bound if himself, unaware, is ordained with fictitious patrimony: and thus decided the referred S. C. Ben. XIV. 1710.

The same thing ought to be said rightly, 22 Dubit. 2. Whoever is ordained after being given a legacy or bound by a promise to repay the donor something after ordination incurs a suspension? It is said after Ordination, for if a renunciation were made before, it would certainly then be considered valid, and hence without doubt (according to the same second judgment quoted in n. 820) he who ordains with patrimony donated but given antipoca or security for that gift post Ordination would incur suspension. D. 8 q. un. p. 5 n. 23. Therefore, a doubt arises whether there would be an agreement concerning the restoration of the patrimony after ordination.

The first sentiment holds that a cleric is not bound to fulfill such an agreement concerning the restoration of property after Ordination; and therefore, he does not incur suspension. This sentiment is maintained by Diara 3 p. tr. 4 R. 184 cum P., ac Escob. nu. 360 cum Sa., et Leand. Reasoning, both because in that case the Bishop acquires a right over that particular patrimony when otherwise he himself would have had to support his ordination; and because since the cleric is truly titled as ordained, he does not incur suspension: The second opinion holds that the cleric should be bound by such an agreement to restore the patrimony and thus incur suspension; this they hold Avila, Corduba, Lopez, and Delacruz in Diana 1. c. Reasoning, because a pact of this kind, even if it is illicit, is not nevertheless condemned by law; hence the cleric who has been ordained is bound in conscience to restore the patrimony under the condition of the donation. But it must be entirely distinguished and said Palao p. 11 n. 15 if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood as pertaining to ordinary election and not extraordinary; and if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood as pertaining to ordinary election and not extraordinary, according to Chapter II. Dub. II.

Concerning the Sacrament of Orders. If he had a mind to give truly, then although a cleric may have sinned by accepting a donation under such a condition after Ordination, nevertheless he is not bound to restore the patrimony, for the reason given in the first aforementioned statement; because the contract is rejected, as being opposed to the Tridentine prohibition of alienating patrimony without the Bishop's permission; and thus suspension does not incur. Thus they understand also those who

precede the aforementioned authorities cited, Toledo. I. c. 48 n. 5 et . C. die 6 Mart 1638 (apud Benedict. XIV.

Notification 26 n. 28) saying: The Sacred Congregation has deemed that he who by fact alienated the patrimony to whose title he had been ordained, without any mention having been made, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be accepted concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, applies that, should a Confessor be elected as a supplement, he might be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted for ordinary election, not for extraordinary one. For if promoted to that title without falling into censures, but the alienation having been made itself null and void by law. And thus similarly the S. C. has repeatedly declared (as P. Zacharia relates according to Croix I. 6 p. 2 ad n. 2286), that every permutation, hypothecation, or fidejussion of patrimony or titulus without the license of the Bishop is invalid, even if the one ordained has means for his maintenance. Si vero donans non habuerit veram intentionem donandi, tunc quidem ordinatus tenetur patrimonium resti- tuere, quia tunc numquam acquisivit illius dominium, cum illa non fuerit vera donatio, sed fictio donatio- nis; ac propterea talis suspensionem incurrit; ita Bonac. I. cit. (quid ut certum habet) . I. 6 D. 32 n. 8. cum 3 R. I. cum n. 367. Neither does this hinder the Tridentine Council, which speaks in prohibition of the alienation of patrimony regarding clerics who truly have obtained it, as is apparent from its own words; whereas those who merely possess or hold the patrimony are not concerned by it.

Nor acquires any bishop right over goods fictitiously given, since the bishop ordaining bona fide is bound to nothing, as correctly says c. cum Navar. et Decio. However, it must be noted that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be accepted in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, let it be held by the cleric: in a case of conscience, to render the patrimony before the third hundred and forty years according to Lib. VI. Treatise. V. Of the Last Unity and Order.

The judgment of the judge, who elevates it higher (as well rightly supposed, says he in both cases with Corduba and with the common), in the external forum does not have any action against the cleric to recover

the given thing, but rather deserves that it be deprived of it as a punishment for its own crime; which seems such a cleric, if immediately sought, so as in judgment the matter is adjudged to him, possibly to retain the thing meanwhile (even though he may already have contracted suspension), according to what was said 1. 3 n. 80o. And it is pertinent that such a decision has been made by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops namely, that the faithful donor should be held as free to dispose of his patrimony according to the order appointed. 83. Doubt. 3. Incurreat suspensionem qui post Diaconatum vel Subdiaconatum susceptum cum patrimonio vere donatus illud donanti renunciat (sine ullo praevio pacto) et deinde Sacerdos ordinatur, oecultando renunciationem? It affirms the Power of Examination.

But it is more correctly negated according to no. 83; hence such a priest is said to be ordained with a true title; yet the penalty innovated by the Canons through Trent is not imposed on those who alienate their patrimony, but only on those who are ordained without it. It does not hinder if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, is such that one ordained thus in fact does not receive the fruits of the patrimony, for it suffices if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, that himself may receive the fruits if he wishes. That is confirmed from the Decree. The Sacred Congregation mentioned above in the preceding number 84. Doubt. 4.

Can a cleric resign from his patrimony without the permission of the Bishop, if he has sustenance from another source? There are three opinions. The first opinion affirms what the three hold in chapter four, question three. Palau p. 11 n. 13. cum Steph. Gratianus, Flaminius et communiores, ut asserunt; item Garcia et Molf., apud quem et probabile putant . 1. 7 c. 6 § 4 n. 19.

Diana part. 9 tr. 8 R. 23 et cum Menoch. Surdus, Cevallos, et Cassanensis; et expressè huic sententiæ consenserunt Sanctiago Conclusorius 1. 7 c. 1 dub. 43 et .qu. 8 art. ult. n. 6. v. 2 abi dicitur: Atque illa (nempè patrimonia, beneficia, etc.) dein-cepit sine licentia episcopi alienari nullatenus possint, donec beneficii sufficiens sint adenti vel aliunde habeant unde vivere possint. If therefore (they say) a cleric cannot without

license from the bishop alienate patrimony until he has elsewhere something whereby to live; hence it is well that he may alienate presumptively without license from the bishop in such a case as where he has somewhere else what whereby to live, for instance to ransom parents who are captives and similar cases. He [the bishop] can then grant license to give away part of the patrimony, even though the cleric himself does not have elsewhere what whereby to live. Second opinion which Led and others hold according to 7 art. 9 n. 6: such alienation they say is illicit but not invalid; rather it is . D. 3i sect. i n. 38. dict, eam esse validam etiamsi Clericus non habeat unde vivat. The third opinion, which Croix holds [n. 2286]. 19 [n. 90: cum Quintana].

Campanile, et Ugol cum Marchino, Cenedo, etc., ac cum Vasq. Philippe et Land. dicunt, hujusmodi alienationem esse invalidam et illicitam. Reason, for this reason, if a cleric does not have sustenance elsewhere, nor can an presumptuous bishop (ordinarily speaking, as the Council intends) grant permission to alienate; for this signifies that clause daneo, namely, if some confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict regarding an ordinary election, but not an extraordinary one, which, if some confessor is chosen as a supplement, can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the period of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict regarding an ordinary election, but not an extraordinary one. The bishop alone can give such license when the cleric has means of support; also because patrimony is considered among ecclesiastical goods and enjoys the same privilege, so that it cannot be subjected to secular princes' levies as is stipulated in chapter Quam-quam of the Decretals, book 6. Therefore such patrimony is without the license of the Bishop inalienable.

And I more willingly adhere to this third sentence, on account of the Decree of S.C., which was issued on the fourth day of February 1652 (at Bened. XIV.) Sic respondit: Renunciationem patrimonii, ad cuius titulum Clericus simpliciter sacris ordinibus fuit initiatus, absque licentia Episcopi factam, non sustineri; praesumptum post assecutionem beneficii ad ejus vitam sustentandam sufficientis. And I rather adhere to this third proposition, according to the Decree of S. C. on the day 4th of February 1652 (apud Bened. XIV), which responded thus: The renunciation of patrimony, to whose title he was simply initiated into the sacred Orders, without the permission of the Bishop having been made, ought not to be sustained, presumptuously after the pursuit of a Benefice for its sufficient support in life. Advae te hic aliud Decretum parandatum à S. C. Coac. 5

Febr. 1604, ubi decisum § 42 Lib.

VI. Treatise. V. In connection with Extreme Unction and Order: it was allowed to a cleric to hypothecate his patrimony so far as that part of the fruits which remained for his sustenance might be used not luxuriously but sparingly, according to the discretion of ecclesiastical judgment. § III. Concerning the obligation of submitting the habit and the tonsure. 825 Qu.

I. Is there a grave sin committed by clerics who do not defer the habit? II. Is there a deprivation for those who do not defer the tonsure? 827 When these, on account of habit and the dismissed tonsure, lose both the privilege of asylum and the canon, to what are priests bound by the way of obedience, which they promise to the Bishop? 828 May they be able to enter into Religion, contradicting the Bishop? What obligation is there concerning Missae and precibus, which are imposed by the Bishop upon those who are ordained? Concerning the statuta in the Concordat of our Kingdom.

IT ISManifest from the entire law of canon law that clerics are to be held to defer to habit and clerical tonsure; whence those who do not defer to these can have their habit and tonsure suspended according to the Council of Trent, session 14, chapter 6. But inquire. I. A cleric commits a mortal sin who does not observe the habit? Affirms Panormit. Even though he is constituted only in minor matters, and proves it from the last chapter of Life, and honestly so.

Others, however, more commonly say that such a cleric has no obligation to submit to a habit; thus also ch. when it is said And this opinion is favored by the decree of Sixtus V. Pastoralis, edited on the day of January 31, 1588, in which it was declared that clerics who do not receive a pension, fruits, or ecclesiastical goods for themselves, or have them reserved and granted to them multiple times, are not obliged to wear the clerical habit. That indeed is certain concerning married priests, as is found in chapter John, on Married Priests. Nempe, si fuerint bigami, non solum non tenentur deferre habitum, sed nec praesumptione possunt habitum deferre ex c. Alternativen de Bigam. in 6. The greater doubt exists regarding beneficed or sacredly instituted clerics: whether these commit grievous sin if they do not bring forward the habit.

Per se loquendo, non dubitandum quin hi graviter peccent, cum ipsi temeritatis arguantur in Trid, ses. 14 o.6 deref. hic verbis: Tanta autem hodie aliquorum inole:it temeritus Religio-nisque contemptus, ut propriam dignitatem et honorem Clericalem parvipendentes, vestes praesumptum

deferant publica laicale... Propterea omnes Ecclesiasticae personae...quae aut in sacris fuerint, aut Dignitates, personatus, Officia, aut Beneficia qualiscumque ecclesiastica obtinerint, si postquam ab Episcopo suo...moniti fuerint, honestum habitum Clericalem...non detulerint, per suspensionem ab Ordinibus, ac Officio et Beneficio, ae fructibus...nec non, si semel correpti; denovo in hoc deliquerint, praesumptum per privatio rem officiorum, et Beneficiorum coerceri possint et debeant. And this in addition must be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary one. This has been declared by Sixtus V in the Bull Cum sacrosancta, published on January 1588 (according to 1.c.n.4.), stating that Beneficiaries who do not present themselves with the habit in the City, and those who have not obeyed within a certain term following the mandates issued concerning these matters, shall be deprived of all dignities, administrations, offices, canonicates, prebends, benefices, and preeminences without any other warning. Cajetanus has also stated this in his Summa, 2. Priest, sins such as these do not constitute mortal sin unless there be contumacy or contempt; and they are both excused and declared not to be mortal unless danger of causing contempt is present. But utterly to be held the opposite, because it is evident from the Council that the very deprivation of a clerical habit is a slight diminution of clerical honor; thus commonly . 7 c. 1 dub. 49. Renzi p. 346 q. 5. oum Arm. p. 18 n. 3. cum. e.3 pa 7a 344 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Five. Concerning the Extrema Unction and Ordination: with the Ban, and with the Abbot and Henry with with the Nun and common. Limitant vero omnes praefati AA... et quidem probabilissime, si hoc fiat ad breve tempus: nisi (ajunt cum Bannez) quis habitum dimitteret vel occultaret, ut alios deciperet vel ut libere per plateas deambularet vel ut aliquod malum committeret.

And thus do Diana on page 10 of treatise 13 and Responsum 29, and Burghaber in Centuriatorium case 59, maintain that a mortal cleric cannot be excused who should run about in bacchanalian revels disguised. They limit this two ways and at two places if there is any just cause for concealing oneself, namely to avoid the danger of death or serious harm. §26 Question NoneII. Clerici peccando graviter, non deferentes tonsuram seu coronam (licet vera corona differat a tonsura, sed DD. confundunt). Alii, ut etc., apud Tam. de affirmant de omnibus clericis ex capite c. 15 de vita et honorem. Of the Clergy. Where it is said: Let them have a coronation and tonsure congruous. Others, as [he] himself 5. with Henry say, this contemptuously, not to be a mortal sin, rashly presumed in

benefices, and clerics in sacred offices; because (as they say) it is argued from no text that this is a grave precept.

However, others, according to chapter 7, section 1, note 49. E. co b. n. 491. et Vasq. l. c. dicunt, Clericos in sacris constitutos et Beneficiatos graviter peccare si Tonsuram seu Coronam non deferant; idque confirmatum potest alicui videri ex sess. 9 (apud) ubi sic habetur: Clerici in sacris constitui barbam nec comam nutriant, sed tonsuram ferant; si quis contra fecerit, excommunicatam incurrat. But this might be answered. If a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it regards the election as odious and strictly to be received in the case of ordinary, not extraordinary elections. This prohibition, which commands the tonsure but does not properly speak of the crown, rather of abuse of beard, is innovated in the canons of the Roman Councils under Pope Zacharias and Gregory XI. (apud eundem Merbes. ibid.) where it was said: If anyone relaxes the beard among the clerics, let anathema be upon him. Wherefore, at least it is not certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he may be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; for the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strictly to be received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, this Conchium prohibiting tonsure, rather than properly from the corona, but more from the abuse of shaving, innovates the Canons of Roman Councils under Pope Zacharias and Gregory XI. (according to the same Merbes, ibid.), where it was said: If anyone relaxes his beard from among the clerics, anathema be upon him.

And hence, since the excommunication imposed on those not deferents corona; and presumptuous as regards those who present a moderate shaving, today for the sake of usage by many, still remaining in Rome, does not seem to fully effect that excommunication. Moreover, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. to the quality of peccati pertinet, Laymann, et Escobar. II. cc. pari modo loquuntur de non deferente Coronam, ac de non deferente habitum. Tamen ait Croix lib. 4 n. 1372. habilitare facilius est mortaliter peccandi non deferendo habitum quam coronam; nam et Sacerdotes

arguuntur de mortali peccato si per sex vel octo hebdomadas coronam non deferant, etiamsi nulla sit apariens de ea vestigia. Other things moreover are to be noted as a complement to 23 for this topic.

I. Notandum: si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Clericus non deferens habitum, et tonsuram, si tertio admonitus ab episcopo non emendatur, amittat privilegium, non solum fori, sed praesumptum canonis, ex capite. Idemque dicitur de clerico se immiscentia in negotiis saecularibus, omissis divinis officiis, ex capitolo ex litteris 16 de vita, et honesta cleric. The same concerning one who carries arms in military attire while wearing lay clothing: if after a third admonition from the Bishop he does not resume clerical attire, and if a confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be confirmed well by another three years following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition on electing a confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed, pertains to ordinary election and not to extraordinary one, which, if a confessor is elected for supplementation, can be confirmed well by another three years following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition on electing a confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be observed, pertains to ordinary election and not to extraordinary one. If such a cleric, dressed in military attire and armed, commits enormities, his canonical privilege shall be revoked, as is evident from the chapter "If anyone persuaded." Causa 17,quaestio 4. It is doubted, whether he loses thereby the presumptively granted privilege of forum?

Some affirm among Fagm in d. cap., but Fagman himself with Alexander say that this is understood regarding Beneficiatis and Constitutis in saeris; for concerning Clerico in minoribus it is stipulated in de Ref. If a Confessarius be chosen as supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessarius beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, the presumed privilege fori does not enjoy it unless... clerical habit and tonsure are worn, 346 Lib. VI. Tract. V. Regarding the Extreme Unction and Order: let a certain Church minister according to the mandate of the Bishop either in a seminary... or in some school... with the permission of the Bishop... it shall be set.

They say here with Farin. and Phlib., if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the

time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be understood for an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one, that article Ei holds true for et c. n. 21., and with Riccio., it is sufficient if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be understood for an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. inservice a certain Church even if it is not that which was assigned according to mandate of Bishop, as declared by S. C. on day 23 XIV. of Synod t. 3 p. 228. That is all the more valid if no Church is designated otherwise, according to another Decree issued therefrom on February 1614. For these however, Minorites who do not conform to the habit and tonsure, no previous warning is given that they will be deprived of the privilege of sanctuary, as the Blessed teaches. XLV. t. 3 p. 181. and Fagnan-in c. Si quis de Foro Compt. We have spoken of the privilege of sanctuary; for otherwise it should be spoken of the privilege of canons, as the Council Decrees teach, bringing forward more of its own Decisions, against de Luca.

In the case, however, where this cleric, having not fulfilled the conditions of Trent, has committed some crime, although he himself cannot invoke the privilege of forum, nevertheless the Bishop can claim him for himself from a secular judge, according to the Decree of the Holy See approved by Si tamen quis habitum dimissum reassumit, provided it is not in fraud of the law, and thus the privileges are restored to their former state, as taught by the same in the common DD. in cap. un. de Cleric. conjug. in 6 et pluribus Decretis S. C. But then it is presumed that reassumption is in fraud if he is already incarcerated in a criminal case or released on bail, as the Holy See and the same Benedict teach. In a civil case, if the habit is reassumed after having been cited to secular forum, Benedict, ibid., says that it is presumed to be done in fraud. The Sacred Congregation published on the 30th day of March 1686. By the same privilege of forum, clerics who have resumed their habit, or have presented themselves with tonsure, and are serving some duty to the Church at the bidding of the Bishop, if they have taken your very self as a virgin, according to chapter 2 of De Foro Competenti. It must be noted that if a Confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; as stated in the last chapter on Tempora.

Ordinatio pro sexto prohibetur ne Tonsura conferatur conjugatis, nisi velint ipsi Religionem profiteri vel sacros Ordines suscipere; si aliquis

Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. non licet eis sine uxoris licensia. Not. I. To promise obedience to the Bishop in his ordination as priest. Here is questioned what for priests are held bound by this act of obedience?

Our Most Holy Father. Father Blessed Benedict XIV. in vol. 2 p. 169 recto. Concerning reverence,) he explains thus: We recognize that those bound by law and the power of such a kind of promise to remain in the service of the Church to which they have been dedicated cannot without license neglect their service. For then (as Urban II. decreed there) one can freely learn, despite opposition from the Bishop. However, the Bishop may, as the Pope states (see 1. 4 n. 75), understand the assertion that through such boasting the Pontiff intends to signify either a lesion or harm to the Church, when he advances the doctrine of the Abbot of Panormitan, who says thus: But if the Church were grievously injured, then he should be recalled. Wherefore concludes the same Pontiff Benedict: And thus provision has been made against a presumptuous Bishop who should seek to assail, contrary to his will, his own cleric and place him in regular cloisters.

Not. II. something concerning Masses and prayers that are imposed on those ordained by the Bishop in the Or-3ation. If a confessarius is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a confessarius beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood to apply to ordinary election, not extraordinary one. This pertains to obligation; others (such as) think that they must be discharged under mortal sin. Others, however, there (as Sot. Val. 548 Lib.

VI. Treatise. V. Concerning the Last Unction and Order: at least Croix holds that it is not under a grave obligation, since the bishops have not declared this. As regards the application of those prescribed Masses, the words which the Bishop has said should be diligently considered are: After the first Mass three masses were said, one of the Holy Spirit, another of the Blessed Virgin, and the third for the Dead; pray also that God will have mercy on me.

From which words rightly infers P. Mazzotta de Sacrifício; and accordingly

such Missas can properly be applied for others with a presumed stipend. It is evident, however, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Such Missae are not to be said before days that do not obstruct. Whether, however, a new presbyter can receive stipend for the Mass which he celebrates with the Bishop? La Croix negat l. 6 p. 2 n. 2323, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. hoc, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. petens Missam video- tur requirere Missam cum omnibus caeremonii et ac- tioiibus, quae peraguntur à Sacerdote in altari. But otherwise he holds differently. XIV. de urgens exemplum Sacerdotum Graecorum cum Episcopo celebrantium, qui aliàs plerumque carere deberent eleemosynā. 830 Not.

III. hoc, si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. hoc habetur statutum anno 1741 circa O; dinationem promoveudorum in concordato inito inter Sanctam Sedem, et Majestatem nostri Regnantis Caroli III, quem Deus sospitet, ubi sic habetur: 1. ni uno poterat esser da ora innanzi promosso alla prima Tonsura, se non che a titolo di Beneficio, o Campbellania perpetua, le cui rotide, dottrauli i pesti ascendano almeno alla meta della tassa stabilita per patrimonium sacre nella Diocesi del Promovendo. II. If some Bishop shall judge a certain young man to be truly useful or necessary to the Church, and shall confer the first Tonsure upon him although he have not a true Benefice, nevertheless he may do so; but this shall be only in the case where said Bishop has himself an ecclesiastical passion of perpetual revenue, which at least reaches half the tax fixed for the sacred patrimony in his Diocese, or even the entire patrimony: which, to avoid any sort of fraud or deceit, henceforth may not be constituted save upon settled estates and upon fixed annual revenues, and shall be regulated according to the Synodal tax of each Diocese; albeit such patrimony neither be less than twenty-four ducats nor greater than forty. III. Besides the requirement of Benefice, perpetual Capellanship, or perpetual ecclesiastical pension as explained above, or of entire patrimony, to no one can the first Tonsure be conferred, who after having completed

ten years of age has not resided for at least a triennium in some Seminary or Ecclesiastical Convitto; and where this cannot be done, he must have at least worn the clerical habit with permission from his Ordinary for three years, and during all that triennium or at least for the greater part of the feasts of precept of each of the three years has served some Church in a manner prescribed by his Bishop, counting this service with the stay which he would have owed to make in some Seminary or Convitto ecclesiastical. Lastly it is said: Whoever shall be promoted to the first Tonsure, to minor Orders, or to sacred Orders according to the form prescribed in the present regulation, besides the penalties mentioned above, will remain perpetually suspended from the exercise of the order already conferred upon him.

E chi l' avrà così ordinato, o pure gli avrà a tal effecto concedute le Dimissorie, se sarà Vescovo, sarà sospeso per un anno dalla collazione degli Ordini, e dall' exercitium de' Pontificali; et non essendo Vescovo, ma Probano inferiore col' uso de' Pontificali, sarà sos- perso per sempre dall' exercitium de' medesimi; et non avendo l'uso di essi, come pure qualunque altra persona constituita in dignità, per sempre sarà sospeso dall' esercizio dell' officio, e de' suoi Ordini. Whether however this suspension be for a remitted or a to-be-suffered penalty? See it stated 'in Censura 1, caput 7, nota 8. TREATISE VI. ON MARRIAGE.

HEAD I. OF SPINALBUS. DOUBT I. What are Sponsals? 831 For the sponsalitia promise to be valid, it must be voluntary and deliberate. 832 If one promises sponsalia to another and then repromises them, is one bound to marry? 833 What if someone wanted to promise but did not wish to obligate themselves? 834 When are minors obligated? 835 Are valid sponsals contracted through a dom? 836 The promise must be mutual. Yes.

I. Is an acceptance of a betrothal understood as a revocation? Whether anyone can bind himself to marriage through a gratuitous promise? And whether it binds under a grave obligation? The promise should be expressed by a sign. What, if parents contract on behalf of their silent children? Dub. 1.

What if outside the enmity? Dub. 2. Is it sufficient if parents promise on behalf of their absent children? Marriage contracts should be made between capable parties. What if the words or signs are doubtful? Present words suitable for Marriage between minors have the force of engagement when applied to the present. Is the same valid in a clandestine Marriage contracted between minors? Is it sufficient for sponsalia to say: I will take no other than you? Is it sufficient to say: I will contract if the Pope dispenses?

Is a merely raising of the ring and a dispatching of gifts sufficient? What if the parents send the ring? Qu I. Is a sponsuality contracted through great fear void of itself? What. II.

What, if by a slight fear? What. III. Whether one who has contracted through a slight fear can dissolve the betrothal? RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRSRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR Cap. I.

Dub. I. Of Weddings: It is said 1. Promise, because a purpose alone does not suffice, since it does not induce an obligation. Wherefore he who should say: "I desire to receive, possess, or lead you in marriage," would not contract espousals, as Bonac. qu. 1 p. 1 teaches, from other circumstances, because these words signify not a promise but merely the intention of a promise, unless indeed something else be gathered from the surrounding circumstances.

It is said 2. Voluntaria, et deliberata, scilicet deliberatione sufficienti ad peccatum mortale, cum sponsalia sub mortali obligent. Diana page 3, point 4. R. 273 ex 1 p. 4 n. 4 plus requirat. Wherefore regularly they are not valid before the completion of seven years, as the Decree of d. 21, art. 5 teaches, unless malice and prudence supply the age.

Diana t. 4 p. 5. R. 274 Pontius, eto. (si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. tamen quidam negant sufficere, cum jus de- terminàrit ætatem) imò nec post septennium, si de usu rationis sufficienti non constet, uti neque si vi, dolo, errore, vel ignorantia circa substantiam, aut notabilem conditionem substantialem, fiunt, secundum dicta de Voto et Contractibus. Question None, si est tenendum matrimonium contrahere, qui 83a fiet promisit sponsalia alteri vere repromittenti? This fiction can diversely happen. 1. If he did not have the intention to contract matrimony. 2.

If he did not will to oblige himself. 3. If he did not will to fulfill it. In the case of a promise made under duress, certainly is not bound to adhere to the promises, since altogether there was no willingness to make the promise. Thus: Title, Chapter 1, Article 25, and contra Lugo; but indeed in the third case it is certain that he is bound, because he has already contracted an obligation. See . 1. c. n. 25 et . 5 et 7, ubi benè advertunt, si

quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si quis sciret oriri obligationem ex promissione, sed ad eam non adverteret, nihilominus teneretur ad promissum, quia jam habuit virtualem voluntatem se obligandi.

The question concerns solely the second case, when one promises but does not wish to be obligated; and it is answered: if he himself was unaware that such a promise would give rise to an obligation regarding the celebration of Marriage, it is certain that he should not be held to the promise, since they say that one who ignores the nature of the promise does not have the true will to promise. Therefore, a doubt arises: whether one is bound by Matrimony who, knowing the nature of the promise, has fictitiously promised spousals without really willing to be bound by Matrimony? The first opinion stated, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; this, namely, he not only sins mortally against justice, but is also held by justice to contract Matrimony; nor will he be excused if he desires to repair the damage by another means. Reason, because in the very promise, when it is true, a necessary obligation inherent to it must exist; but since whoever promises minimally does not thereby minimally oblige himself, yet whenever he truly promises, he cannot avoid being obliged according to the condition of the contract, for it would be unjust to separate his own proper obligation from the promise; thus probably, as stated by the Pontificius de Matrimonio lib. 12 c. 2 n. 7 with Vasquez c. n. 2 v. I say further, Sotus, Lop. in . de Matr. lib. 1. l. 24 n. 12.

Renzi de 2. . tit. l. 8 c. 1 § 4 n. 5. c. 1 n. 28 cum Cornejo, et Diana, negat esse obligationem contra hendi. The principal reason is because every obligation which does not arise from law proceeds from the private will of a man; therefore, where the will to oblige oneself is lacking, the obligation is wanting. And this even if the promise was confirmed by an oath, as they teach. Disp, 9 n. 9 cum Sancto Bono. Saint Anthony.

Medina, et 1 art. 3 qu. 3) enseña que el juramento no obliga cuando falta la intención de obligarse; pues el juramento sigue la naturaleza de la promesa. Nor does it hinder the rationale of the century mentioned above, which states that, supposing Socrates: he who promises sins against justice by deceiving another party; yet he was not bound to give true consent according to justice, since no contract obligation existed for entering into

such a contract, and thereby obtaining any right over him through his own consent. Therefore, he is held later on account of the deception to restore damages, but he is not bound on the account of promising truly to give consent and to enter into marriage. On the other hand, it must be said thus if defloweration intervenes, because then the deflowerer is altogether bound to marriage, since there is no other way then that can satiate equivalent damage being resarcified, as we have said in lib. 3 ex n. 642. It suffices for the validity of nuptials between minors that the reasonableness thereof be probingly recognized in them. This is thought to be more probable with the common opinion, as they say, etc., against Bonac. and Henry.

Verum tamen sunt irrita sponsalia contrahita per dolum dandam causam contractui, etsi versantem tantùm circa qualitatem? It affirms. L. R. D. 64 n. 3 with Mol. Concilium autem et alii quos citavimus l. 3 n. 715 de tertio tituli de Habe, verò tunc deceptus actionem irritandi contractum propter injuriam et defectum consensus, idque currit, etiamsi deceptio provenerit a tertio alio, parte ignorantia, ut docet . 4 et 5. Moreover, it is sufficiently probable with Lessio, n. 715 and with question 2, article 1, n. 2, that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict, and to be strictly interpreted in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary; hence, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict, and to be strictly interpreted in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. A deceived party should not be held in conscience to stand by the contract, if his error were truly invincible. But now, considering the first sentence, namely, that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict, and to be strictly interpreted in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary; hence, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict, and to be strictly interpreted in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. Are the promises thereby per se rendered invalid, presumptively deceiving one remaining liable? They affirm that . c. et Pontius l. 4 c. 21 n. 7 cum Con.

Val. 3 n. 715 cum Lug. . . » It is said 3. Mutual. Wherefore if Titius promise nuptials to Cajus and these he accepts without a counter-promissio, neither

is he obligated; because, since a contract of espousals is burdensome and reciprocal, it cannot be concluded; for it involves a condition, if you promisso again. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. If however Titius's promise had been absolute and gratuitous, and accepted by Cajus, only Titius would have been obligated, not through the bond of sponsals, but simply through the promise.

Ita. 3 d. 3. contra Pontium apud 4 res. 244. Here is the question for this chapter. Whether, by accepting nuptials in this very way, a simultaneous re-promising be understood? The first sense affirms this, and the Popes hold this in their book twelve chapter four note ten with Saint Anthony. Palud. c. 1 n. 16. with Vasq.

Henry. Leander, and Gabriel to Saint Vincent. Reason, because the acceptance of Matrimony at present includes a virtual promise, or will, to do this, when Marriage is valid neither party must be unobliged; thus an presumptuous acceptance of sponsals, which follow the nature of Marriage. Herefrom these authors argue with Molina and Boscovich that if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, allows for such confirmation when both sponsors are not thereby obligated, lest one remain obligated. The second opinion, however, holds that to be more probable and maintains it. 1.

D. 5 n. 15. c. 1 n. 18 cum Dic. Neither does the acceptance include a renewed promise, because anyone can accept an obligation imposed upon another without obligating himself. They note however, that this should be understood if the promisor intended to bind himself spontaneously independently from another's promise, and that this is certain; for in a doubtful case, as they say, he is to be considered as not wishing to be bound without re-promise. And in such a case it should be noted that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict,

should be understood with regard to an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. The fact is that such a promise would not be a sponsio of marriage; hence it would not introduce any impediment to public honesty, but would be merely a gratuitous promise, obligating only one party by the mere force of fidelity, not by the force of the sponsalia. Question None

II. Who can bind himself to contract matrimony gratuitously by means of a free promise, remaining at liberty on the part of the other? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by Pope Alexander I, lib. 1, dist. 12, cap. 4, n. 2, when he calls Diana probabilem in tractatus de peccato mortalibus, lib. 3, cap. 4. R. 244. Reason, because a matrimonial contract is like an exchange or permutation; hence no one can bind themselves therein unless under condition that the other also mutually binds himself.

The second opinion, however, is more common and probable, asserting this very point, which Bus. holds as stated above, and D. 1, 5, n. 12. Escob. 1. 24 n. 71. et cum Ratio, quia, licet per vim promissionis sponsalitiae non possit unus remanere obligatus, si altero manente libero; tamen bene potest aliquis per vim simplicis promissionis gratuita se obstringere independenter a contractu sponsalium. Whether however this promise obligates under a grave penalty? Whether this promise obligates under grave matter depends on another question raised in I. 3 n. 720, where we said with Henry, etc. Thomas Aquinas, the sentiment is sufficiently probable.

However truly they observe c. et tr. 3 c. 1 § 1 n 4: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Regulariter numquàm sponsi intendant gratis se obligare sine conditione si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. alter praesumptum se obliget. « Dicitur 4. Expressly by a sign; because a contract between human beings is not formed, unless by an external sign. Wherefore the pretended tacit consent to espousals does not suffice with respect to Cajus, even when there is an internal consent in the promise of marriage, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Titius ei promittit. If however the

father, or mother, for the son, or daughter, or curator for him whom he is to have in his care, being present and not contradicting, provided that you are absent, contracts validly; because in this case the law accepts taciturnity in lieu of expressed consent. But even if for a absent person: at least if he having become aware of it either expresses it explicitly, or ratifies it by some sufficient sign tacitely. Against whom Sol. and Henr. do not even require this. But only that the aware one does not contradict.

If a confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, is received. Coun. admits, if by themselves tutors or parents are proposed to them; for then if they remain silent, it will be considered as consenting. » If parents contract betrothals in the presence of a son who remains silent and does not contradict, they are thereby valid, as commonly taught. 1 C. 23 n. 5. and elsewhere similarly. And it is evident from chapter one section 1 at the end of De sponsis impubes in six [where] Boniface. VIII. Thus he declared: Moreover, from the sponsalia which parents usually contract on behalf of their minor or non-adult children, if the children themselves have expressly consented to them, or have tacitly agreed by not contradicting them when present, they are thereby obligated.

The same must also be said: if a mother contracts [a marriage] in purported authority for her son, as commonly and rightly teaches the Pontifical law, Book 2, Chapter 14, Note 2. Page 4 note 14. With Abb., and this is inferred from the said text, where it is not stated 'fathers' but 'parents'; for the reason is that in this matter there is no regard to paternal authority, but to the affection of parents towards their children: mothers love their children no less than fathers do. The same is said by Busemb. as above, in the chapter concerning tutors and curators promising for minors and wards. But they more plausibly deny this, n. 48, because this has been established only with regard to parents. That proceeds nevertheless only for the external forum, as well Bon. and Roncag. rightly observe.

II. cc. ac cum Anaclia. For in the internal forum, if the son has dissented, certainly he is not obligated by those contracts entered into with his parents. And indeed, in all respects, I think it must be said that if the son has negatively held himself without dissenting nor concurring. Doubt. I think that exactly the same must be said if the son has negatively behaved himself without dissenting neither in Chapter I.

Regarding espousals, feeling; for in order to contract any positive obligation, consent is required. The aforementioned text does not hinder

what is said about being bound; for to Matrimony, and thus similarly to espousals, which follow the nature of Matrimony, internal consent of those contracting is not sufficient, but external expression of consent is required either by word or by sign, as stated in the Cap. Sufficit. Although espousals contracted solely through internal consent do not hold, they are valid nonetheless in this particular case, as Boniface decrees, namely if the father contracts on behalf of his son without protest from him; but the Pontiff is understood to speak thus only when the son internally and positively consents. And thus truly they concur with me and n. 46 when they say, then only does the silence of the son render the sponsals valid, when the son internally consents. Doubt. 1. whether it is special, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; suffice it by the presence and tacit consent of the children if the parents contract on their behalf? They deny the Hostiens.

Manuel, et 1. 1 D. 22. n. 7., qui dicunt, id procedere, etiam si extraneus contrahat sponsalia pro alio praesente et tacente; quia (ut ajunt), cum hic agatur de re appetibili, quisque tacens consentire videtur. They confirm this from c. 1 de Matr. contr. contra Eccles., etc., where it is judged that valid sponsalia are initiated by a brother for his sister when she is present and tacitly consenting, as the text there weighs certain signs of tacit consent. And to this opinion let the supposed [or pretended] chapter of Victor consent. Henry; speaking nevertheless for the external fury alone. But most commonly, and more truly is it considered as a special matter for both forums by Escob. n. 1169 n. 17. et. 7. cum S. Gabr. to be affirmed by sponsals contracted by parents.

Cov. Tab. et aliis alorimis ex 27 q. 1 ar. 2 q. 3 ad 3. Reason: although Marriage per se is appetible, yet the obligation towards it is burdensome; but since parents, on account of their great love for their children, are presumed to have in mind what is best for them, the children are rightly considered to consent to their parents' promise; however, this reason does not hold for others. Nor does it hinder the rule of law 43. in 6. He who is silent seems to consent.

For indeed they well respond that this proceeds in favorable cases, but not in obligatory ones; wherefore the opposite is more appropriately presumed: and especially in marriages, where (as we have said) a positive requirement calls for consent. Neither does the text above oppose it, for it responds to Esc. 1. c., according to the Gloss., there having truly been

expressed a consent, and other signs of tacit assent are to express the text, so that true consent may be confirmed by those manifested. However rightly it admits the first opinion, if anywhere (as among the Indians) there had been a custom that consent be expressed through others. Dubitatur. 2. an, cum parentes contrahunt sponsalia pro filiis absentibus, sufficiat ad eorum valorem, si filii certiores facti non contradicant? The first opinion denies this, saying that it is required for the engagement agreements themselves to be ratified by some special express sign or by a tacit one: thus 2 D nbit. 23 n. 17.

Pope 1. 2 c. 14 n. 14. and 1 10 c. 9 n. 9. q. 5 R. 2. with Vega, and Cordoba, and with Molina. Fillius caput unicuique de hoc dicit: Et idem est, si filii temporis sponsalium absentes et praesumptione ignorantia eadem sponsalia post scientiam tacita vel expressa ratificant. Therefore (as they argue), there is established a difference between sponsalia contracted in the presence of the sons, where silence suffices; and sponsalia contracted by absent sons, where more is required of explicit or implicit ratification. The second sentence says that it suffices for contracting, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, to be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary; therefore they remain silent and do not contradict; this opinion holds Bon. qu. 1 p. 1 n. 11. with Con. et Henr. and Soto, Th. 4 D. 27 qu. 2 art. 2 ad 1. where he says: They have strength (the sponsalia) insofar as those between whom they are contracted coming to the due state do not claim, and understand themselves converted which has been effected through others. Reason, because from the said text it suffices that the sons expressively or tacitly ratify the sponsalia; “expressively therefore it is understood as consenting, tacitly by not contradicting, and hence the Pontiff says: And the same thing; and there he says they have ratified, because it concerns actions already completed by others.

Both opinions are probable, but the second is more probable. However, it is rightly observed that in addition it is required, either by himself or through a letter or messenger, that the parent inform the son:... «It is said 5.. among the skilled: id est, who are at an age of 840 ». years prescribed: they have, and no impediment». They are prohibited. "... '1.' When words or signs are doubtful, in the foreground stands the intention of those contracting conscience, if from that it be certain; but externally, according to common understanding and sense of words, yet so as rather to incline in favor of marriage. When words or signs are doubtful, in favor of the intention contracting, it stands; in the external, communi intelligere et sensu verborum, thus so that it inclines rather to the favor of marriage.

Res. 205. v. says: in favor of liberty.) *... 2. Words of the present, fitting for minors in favor of liberty, according to 841 marriage, since by positive law this is null, have the force of betrothal. The reason is interpretative intention of those contracting; because an act, when it does not have effect, has a better validity than that with which it is made; yet nuptial espousals are contained in virtue within marriage. 3 n. 17. ... Hoc principium est commune apud omnes; ita enim docti. D. 2 n. 2.

Pontius 1. 12 c. 5: n. 4..: 8 et ux.§. Idem, de Despon, impub. ubi id expressum habetur; modo (iatalligendum) impubes interius non. expressè dissentiat. "But: does the same apply internally among minors? That is, if a marriage is clandestinely contracted, that is to say without parish and witnesses, would it be valid?" They affirm 18. Con. Rabbi, and Vega, in the session 24, chapter R, note n. i3o, also Avila.

Henr. n. 5z probable putat rationem, quia, ut dicietur in dicto §. Idem actus qui non valet ut fit, valet tamen ut fieri potest. But most commonly and more reasonably they deny it. i. D. 20 n. 3. p. 262 n:14. 3 n. 12 cum aliis pluribus, et qui affert Declar. Cardinals. Reason, because, when there is no act, it is no longer on the part of contracting, but on its own part alone; hence, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it might well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in view of ordinary election, and not extraordinary, is contrary to good morals, and resists that right (the integrity of which is resisted by the Tridentine session 24 c. i declaring Matrimony altogether void, and further persons altogether incapable thereof), then such an act produces no obligation ex l.

Not a doubt, C. de Legib. 43. "3. To sponsalia non sufficit v: Si dicas, Non du-cam aliam; quia sunt verba mere negativa et potest ducere nullam. The same is rightly held c. i. n. 44. n. 213 et 224, and commonly, as it attributes; ao. i. D. 19 n. 5 cum Henr. etc. contra Aug. etc. ibid. n. 3. Reason, because such words, although they import something, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; for, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. If he wishes to choose that of the two, he cannot accept the other, as Laym: et

alii commonly advert; yet per se they do not import this, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; for, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he is bound to choose that.

We say per se, for another must be said with Bon. Escob. et . It is most probable that the Pontiff says in 1. 4 c. 10 n. 7., i art. 4 n. 2 cum Perez, et alii: "I volo nisi te tunc vere contrahat sponsalia." "One does not sufficiently say to contract sponsalia," contra Ac; therefore licitum est utrique con- Cap. I. dubitatio First.

Of espousals. "To drag away, before and after having requested the pension from the Pontiff with the consent of one party, [and] to dissolve with the unwillingness of another." If however they have been magnified as causes for dispensation, it will be deemed necessary to refund them upon resiling (Thus these very espousals, when completed according to condition, are more probingly valid, in accordance with what is said note 859.). And in the meanwhile, although they are not efficacious for inducing an impediment to public honor, they nevertheless bind one to petition a dispensation, if the Pope relaxes such an impediment; otherwise, if he does not usually do so; see said book 3, n. 65.) * Subtraction of the ring, and dismissal from official duties; unless custom dictates otherwise for the homeland. The reason is, because it can arise from other cases * (Ita praesumptum 1 D. 22 n. 2.

Concerning page 262 note 13 and elsewhere. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strictly to be received for ordinary election but not for extraordinary, operates in the same manner; yet if the words of one [prior] have preceded, then the insertion of the ring, and the word, receive, operate as sponsalia, or as presumed matrimonial contract, on account of the reason of promise, as Fill teaches. Because by receiving the ring thus he tacitly consents: likewise, when a groom sends arrha and dowry goods in agreement with his friends concerning marriage, the bride accepts them: this is done for the reason of a promise, as Fill teaches. » Sylv. . Arm. Cov. et aliis; et hoc etidensi- (ut hi dionț) non adsit verbum recipio, ut vult Busemph. sufficit enim sola acceptatio Si autem parentes annabum mittant ad sponsam, non presumitur filius contraesse sponsalia, nisi annulus ex suo consensu missus fuerit, ut rectè sentiunt Palaus l. c. n. 7. et cum etc.)* 4. Sponsalia contraota per metu gravi firmata juris promissione sunt invalida: quia

juramentum ex metu torto non firmat contractum; imò probabiliter nec obligat, adeoque relaxationem non indiget.

It is sought in chapter two. Whether spousal contracts justly concluded through great fear are themselves invalid in their very juridical nature? The first opinion affirms this, and they hold to this view. I. 4 D. 21 n. 3. Pontius I. 4 ch. 6 n. 12. . 3 tr. 4 ch. 6 n. 3. 6. cum Bec.

Cov. Diana et Aversa, et cum Panorm., impudenter ubi, cum quaedam puella contraxisset sponsalia cum juramento, postea nolens (ut ait textus) et invita, minis parentum impulsâ, adducta fuit in domum sponsi; ideo Pontifex declaravit eam liberam esse ab illis sponsalibus. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be rightly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, such that this girl would not have contracted spousal obligations through fear, but rather through being brought by force into the bridegroom's house. For commonly the Doctors and the Glossa presuppose that this girl was betrothed by fear; and rightly says Sanchez, conjecturally to be understood in that text, for otherwise the Pontiff would not have declared her free from that betrothal obligation. It is said through a great fear; for if it were light, it would otherwise be expressed, as we shall see shortly.

Question. II. It is called by unjust fear, because if it were just, the dowry would indeed be valid; for then the party which contracted it would be irrationally unwilling, if he did not wish to contract it, as they rightly say in n. 66 according to the expressions in n. 5057. The second opinion, which Conink holds. D. 28 n. 7. . 1 art. 8 n. 9. item apud te- aet, hujusmodi sponsalia ex metu gravi contracta possent quidem irritari à metu passo, sed non esse per se irrita; ideoque dict, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. Si adfuit juramentum, debeat ipsum servari donec relaxetur.

Reason, because all contracts, except for Marriage alone, are initiated through fear and thereby valid in themselves, according to what is stated in law 3 n. 717. The respondent, however, to the text taken from the aforementioned chapter according to Letters, if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a

Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be understood concerning ordinary election, but not extraordinary, was being considered regarding a girl who had entirely unwillingly contracted, and thus her promise was declared irremissibly void. Both opinions are probable; but the first seems to me more probable; for although in general speaking concerning contracts, the contrary is a slender objection (as I said), namely, if some Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict when applied to ordinary election, not extraordinary, which was about a girl who had been altogether unwilling in contracting, and thus her promise was irritably declared; whereby both opinions are probable; but the first seems to me more probable; for although in general speaking concerning contracts formed by fear, they are of themselves valid, regarding betrothals, there is an objection that arises; because in other contracts, since these do not agree with each other per se and the law does not resist them, one can easily be bound by fear to maintain such a contract unless he wishes to rescind it; but no one can be obligated to perform an act which is of itself void, and which is resisted by right; what kind of marriage could be contracted during such a fear; hence no one can be bound per se to that kind of marriage or its means, or whatever are betrothals; for dispositions produce the same nature as acts, and thus Doctors generally assert that betrothals follow the nature of Marriage. Add, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. connexorum idem debeat esse judi- cium, ut infertur ex cap. Translato, de Constitut. Wherefore, a marriage out of fear is invalid; the same should be said of betrothals.

From these it is inferred, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not supplementary. That which pertains to the connexions should likewise be the judgment, as it is stated in cap. Translato, de Constitut. Similarly, it may be said about marriages out of fear that they are invalid; the same must be said regarding sponsals. Question is sought after II. Whether valid sponsals are contracted through light fear, which gave a cause for the contracting? The first opinion denies this, and those who

hold this view include 6 n. 46. c. 12 n. 288. et cetera. The reason is because he, who through fear (even though it be slight), compels another to consent, still imposes injury upon him; hence one who is thus undeserving should not derive benefit from his own wickedness. The second opinion, however, is more common and probable, and those maintain this view: namely, 4 c. 10 n. 5. with Medina, with Aversa, Croix l. 7 p. 3 n. 105.; hence, if you did not repel it, you are deemed to have spontaneously wished such an injury to endure.

Seek. III. Whether one who entered into espousals out of fear from a slight cause for contracting such may dissolve that in conscience? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by Pon. in l. 4 c. 10 nn. 6 et 10 et 4 a. 3 n. 6. Perrez states that this opinion is sufficiently probable, but the second opinion affirming it is more common and appears more probable, which is held by . 3 tr. 4 c. 6 n. 4. and . 4 D. 19 n. 6. Wigandt tr. 3 n. 19.

Mazzotta tom 4 p: 142. Cross n. 105. with 22 n. 138. with . and considers probable . 4 art. 3 n. 7. Reasoning, because, when fear has given a cause for the contract such that it would otherwise not have been initiated, instilling fear is bound to rescind the contract; hence, congruously it is bound to relax faith unjustly taken through such fear, so much so that the fear endured can recall the given faith. That would proceed all the more, if he had apprehended that terror as severe; although in itself it was light, because in that case he could not easily repel such a terror, it was congruent for him to know it as light. Now what is to be said if the fear has been just, either intrinsically; see what is said in number 1053. ## DUBIUM II. ## What and how great is the obligation of sponsals f. 845 Sponsalia obligate under a grave reason.

Whether then they are obligated immediately to enter into Matrimony? Whether a Judge can and ought to compel unwilling ones to Matrimony? Whether fornication of the fiancé or fiancée, with another person of different guise, is permitted? Falsely promising is not bound to marry, unless he has coerced copulation from a virgin. (See presumptively stated matters in Rest. 1. 3 n. 622.) If someone has contracted sponsalia with two women and then slept with the second, which one should he marry? Regarding persons contracting marriage without knowledgeable parents. Whether such marriages be valid? Yes. I.

And how do the children who are married, when they sin with parents either uninformed or unconsulted? What if betrothal vows have been made? What if the bridegroom shall have deflowered the virgin after those things? Do prelates owe it to prevent such recent impediments? By what, however, are those children excused who contract matrimony without the

consent of their parents?

II. Is a son bound to obey his father giving orders concerning Marriage? 851 Quæst. III. Does a notable disparity in condition or status between the contracting parties irritate the espousals? Not; resilience loses the dower, etc. I.

What, if a woman promises to give something to a man, so that he may take her as his wife, and conversely? II. What if a woman promises to give something to a man so that he may take her, and what if conversely? Not. Regarding the penalty assigned to the one who resists. What? I.

May a license be assigned to inflict punishment on one who resists unjustly? Qu. II. Is a just and resilient one held to promised punishment with an oath? Qu.

III. Whether one who has suffered the punishment is bound to receive and restore it? What? IV. What if a legacy is left to a maiden, so that she may marry with some person, and she contracts marriage with another?

What. V. What, if a betrothed is left so that he does not marry, and she does marry? 854 May kisses and embraces be permissible between spouses? R I RESPONDERI. They are obliged to consummate the marriage under the weight of a mortal sin, * (Ida commonly all say (vide »); and it is clear from c. Ex litteris de sponsal. The reason is that, although a simple promise does not, according to the probable opinion, entail a serious obligation, it is otherwise concerning a mutual promise, which constitutes a perfect contract obligating both parties. However, if the term is not prefixed, sufficiency exists if the promisor fulfills when demanded by the promissory party, or according to the custom of the region.

The reason for the prior one is evident from the nature of a burdensome contract, concerning a serious matter. The reason for the latter is, because that is common to all debt. Therefore, it is concluded. Conrad, dec., 22, dub., i apud Pontius tamen ibidem vult obligari statim post contractum. » Therefore, it is asked, whether he who contracted espousals without a previous time prefixed for Marriage to be contracted, is bound to bring about that, so that it can be accomplished promptly and conveniently; the first opinion denies this, saying that it should only be binding when the other party demands it; just as Busembach said above, i D. 28 n. 2, with Abbreviators and Piringius, and with Paludanus, because so it is found in 1.

Present creditors, according to C. de Pignor. where it is said: Creditors should first be convened by denunciation. However, the second opinion is more truthful in its affirmation, and this are the views of Pontius 1:12 c.6 n. i. 7 n. 2. c. 1 n. 85. with Con. . Reason, because it is thus explicitly expressed in 1. In all ff. de Reg. Jur. ubi sic dicitur: In omnibus obligationibus, in quibus dies non ponitur, praesenti die debetur. And in 1.

That which is quoted from ff. concerning the verb of obligation, namely: If a confessory is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessory beyond a three-year period should be understood as odious and strict in matters of ordinary election, not extraordinary; without an prefixed term, it should be immediately due. However, objections are made against the opposite text: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. That which is thus established only pertains to debtors who have given pledges which, according to law, ought not to be taken from creditors until the debtors are warned. But it is to be noted this, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, well may it be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning the choice of a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; that is, such a prohibition should not be imposed without any prefixed term, it must be immediately imposed. DD. primae sententiae (ut secundae sententiae (ut c. et Salm n. 85. cum et sic praefatae sententiae satis conciliantur. What, however, if a terminus prefixed to the sponsals is set for the intended marriages? See no. 867 for this to be said. “1.”

Resilien s cogi potest ad matrimonium praesumptum à » judice per censuras: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. tamen rarò expedit ob » periculum infeliciis exitus. No doubt, as we have said, he would grievously sin in the forum of conscience by unwillingly failing to fulfill the espousals without just cause. It is doubtful, whether the judge can coerce one who does not wish to comply? Some affirm, others deny, unless the promise be confirmed by an oath. Others deny it, even if a vow was made.

And they deem all these opinions probable; but more truly and commonly

do they discourse Pont. 1. 12 c. 6 n. 2. with 1. 1 D. 20 n. 4. with S. Bonav. S. Antonin et aliis innumeris, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si ex tali Matrimonio timeantur rixæ aut scandala, non debeat Judex ad illud ineun- dum cogere partem invitam; secùs si scandala non iimeantur; et ità habetur expressum in c. Ex litteris 10 de sponsal. ubi dicitur: Ecclesiasticus censurd compellas nisi rationabilis causa obstiterit. And thus S. C. [CLEMENT] decreed to abstain from coercion, sustaining it with some probable cause: but on the other hand he approved another thing, as is referred to by P. Zacharia in Croix, lib. 6, p. 3, ad n. 62. Rightly moreover do Busemb. and : concur with this, P. Concina saying that it is always less evil that the innocent party abstain from such a marriage. Item rectè advertit quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria si pars renitens fuerit ex-commuticata et persistat Judex debeat eam absolvere quia tunc non speratur profectus et contra si tale Matrimonium contraheretur prudenter malus exitus timendus esset.

They also note Sal., n. 92. namely, that if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, but not to extraordinary one; and that, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, but not to extraordinary one, whereas if the betrothals are such, both the Ecclesiastical Judge and the Secular have authority to lead the bridegrooms to Marriage. 2. If the Judge according to the alleged and proven facts compels 3/7 to Marriage, although the coercion against the parties is regarded as unjust with regard to the matter, the Marriage is valid. Perez, contra R. 26. » 3. Fornicatio sponsae est circumstantia in confes- sione exprimenda, quia multat speciem, et consti- tuet injustitiam, quæ in sponsa gravis est, ideòque mortalis habetur, ut si quis rem alteri promissam notabiliter corrumpat: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. tamen sponsus non censetur facere fornicando, cum in viro

fornicatio non tanti æstimetur, nisi aliud accedat. 1 dist. 2.

Conick. . etc., probably contrary. 176. About this question there is a threefold probable opinion present. The first proposition states that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, his confirmation can be well supported by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary one. Furthermore, it is said that fornicated party may wear malice in different guise, both bride and groom; and thus they hold c. 1 n. 6. Moreover, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, his confirmation can be well supported by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary one; for he, who through formication causes slight injury to the bride only, may be considered to sin in different guise. D. 2 n. 6. et alii apud Tertia demùm sententia adhùc satis probabilis, quum tenent Pontius 1. 21 c. 6 n. 8 et . Diana, and according to article 7.

Lugo de Peen. D. 16 n. 17 cum 1. c. et ne quid usque adhuc corpus suum tradiderit. Therefore it runs equally for the groom as for the bride; for if she were to commit an injustice by contracting marriage with a groom, she would not thereafter be able to contract marriage with him unless she disclosed some hidden fault in her body, because then there would be inequality; but she is not bound to do this, as Pontius says along with others (see n. 864 ad n. II): therefore equity is present, and consequently it does not commit injustice. « 4. Who by a simulated mind promised, speaking according to himself, is not bound to nuptials, although he should make reparations for the harm created. I said this per se, because if through the act of making a promise he led a maiden to coitus, he is bound to take her as his wife.

Good Man 1. chapter 2. paragraph. If he accepts, where the maiden is much inferior in condition, for example as regards nobility or riches: then indeed he is not bound to take her, for instance a nobleman's daughter from a peasant family; especially if she herself be aware of their different status, or condition, and if one Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary choice, not extraordinary. But if he should rather wish to be deceived than himself deceive, then indeed she may not be required to provide dowry for that case; yet still if herself she did not know the inequality of status, or if the man himself had not promised marriage but

intended it from his heart, then. Thus Bonac., q. 1, p. 3, n. 7, and sequentia, ex Vasq. Mol. d. 106. . 1 d. 10. V. . 2 c. 10 » d. 3. et M.

Per. d. 2 s. 3 ˚ (De hoc vide illa, quae fusè notavimus de Resti. » 1. 3 ex n. 642.) ˚ 548 » 5. Post-betrothal contra prior faith initiated, even though formally sworn, or supposed conjugal access commenced—Cap. I. Dub. II.

On nuptial contracts — he says, they are invalid. The contrary opinion is held by R. 210. Marriage nevertheless contracted after betrothal with another is valid, although unjust. Bon. p. 5 et 7. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary; therefore, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary. Thus commonly Bossius c. 3 n. 90. 2 art. 7 n. 3. Holzrn. n. 217 and others similarly throughout.

It is doubtful, if she had been unaware. The first sentence said, the sponsum was to be held as contracted with the second, if it had been joined to this in such manner; thus Piva l.c., Pont. l. 12 c. 14 n. 4 with the Major. Boss. loc. cit., cum Diana, et loc. cit., cum Con. Resp. et Leand. The reason is, firstly because from chapter Is, which treats of faith and sponsals; formerly, through the union of the soul by a marital bond, sponsals passed over into Matrimony; although this Matrimony no longer exists today according to the new law of the Twenty-fourth Session of Trent, yet that text establishes well-founded law in matters, so if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, being odious and strict, is understood differently for ordinary election than for extraordinary; which, when a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, can be sufficiently confirmed through another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, being odious and strict, is understood differently for ordinary election than for extraordinary. This acquisition occurs by corporal tradition in the second sponsal, which formerly constituted Matrimony: firstly because, when one acts with intent to acquire profit, and another seeks to avoid damage, this latter should rather be favored; rather than the former considered as a reward.

The second opinion is more common and probable to be held, that the sponsus ought to contract with the prima sponsa, although there has been a copula with the secunda sponsa, thus: 1. D. 49 n. 5 cum c. 22 n. 26. R. 24 . 370 n. 17 cum communi, ut asserit, Escob. n. 245. Holzrn. n. 117 cum Manstr. et et Aversa. Reason, because a promise made as a second engagement is always null with respect to an illicit matter, since it is the promise made prior to the first engagement: nor does the injury suffered by another deprive this claim of right.

And this, even if the second promise has been firmly established as a vow, as some say, c. and others; because a vow cannot be a bond of injustice. Nor does the first reason oppose the opposite opinion, for according to the text: "that one" (as rightly say Navarr. . cc. with Soo, and others). Neither is valid the second reason, for here it is not truly a matter of a profitable contract, but rather of an onerous one, since it binds both ways compulsively. They nevertheless say Sporer 1. c. ac cc., if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; which, since, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; by reason of equity the first promise ought to yield its right if the other should suffer grave damage through defloweration, since charity obliges one to endure a lighter harm so that the neighbor does not incur the most grievous; hence they say Henry in c. et Croix with others, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary., Judge in such a case can properly constrain the sponsus to bring about the second marriage.

But not unreasonably they hold that she is not bound by this, because the second [party] should bear the blame for her sin, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, from equity should hold that the first promise yield to justice, if the other incurs a grievous damage through defloweration; since charity obliges one to endure slight harm so that the neighbor does not suffer the greatest; hence

they add Henry in chapter and Croix with others, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Free men, who with the knowledge of their parents have contracted espousals with those of unequal condition, for instance a noble with an ignoble, although they may sin, nevertheless are bound; nor can they be hindered by their parents that they keep the faith given. c. n. 12. ex S. 7. Resol. 71. ex Mol. . It is certain that marriages contracted by children of a family without the consent of their parents are valid, against Luther, Bucer, and Erasmus (according to Bellarmine it is evident from where he says: Whoever falsely asserts that marriages contracted by children of a family without the consent of their parents are invalid, and that parents can ratify or invalidate them, is mistaken). Whereby it does not seem to be a sufficiently probable opinion of Pont. 1. 2 c. 1 n. 5 and Tourn.

Prael. nam obstat communis sententia omnium Scholasticorum, ut ipse Pont. fa- tetur, et videtur certum esse ex praefato textu Concilii. From this Sporer c. 5 n. 202. and others commonly infer, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being as odious, strict, and to be accepted as such in ordinary election but not extraordinary, congruous such Marriage is valid, so let sponsalia also be thus. Nor does Holzrn. officiate concerning the text in I i § 7 ff. de Spons., where it seems to require the consent of parents for the value of the dowry, similarly as is required in Matrimony according to I. If as you propose, 7 C. eodem titulo. He responds accordingly, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For although the law prohibits such kinds of sponsalia, it does not thereby invalidate them.

This concerning validity; but it is inquired whether, and when, and how filial children can contract marriage without the consent of their parents? Four are the opinions. The first opinion, and indeed the more common one taught universally, holds that they sin mortally if they contract a marriage rashly, whether parents are consulted or unwilling; so Pontius 1. 2 c. i n. 26. 2. D. 166. 47, art. 6. Conclusion 4.

From Abelly page 205, line 3. D. Francis Muscuttula, Bishop of Rosso, to whom very recently learned annotations were added by the most erudite

Canon of Naples. Alelius Mazzochius, ubi citantur pro eadem sententia Megalesius. Fag. Friend.

March. Vidal, Platel, et alii: sed non tunc, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. ex his plures (ut observavi), prout Estius, Turrecrem. Juvenin et Cabass dicant, haec Matrimonia esse illicita (si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. reverà omnes DD. concedunt), sed non expli- cent, an sub culpa gravi, vel levi. This opinion is proven 1 from c. Aliter, Causa 3o qu. 5, where it reads the Decree of that Varistus Pope, by which it was said to be presumed not conjugia but adultery, those which are done without consent of parents, and without previous prayers, without blessing of Priest, and custody of Paranimph, etc. And from c: It is honored 32 qu. 2 where it is said that the spouse of virginity should not be chosen, but rather judgment of parents to be expected. Moreover, it is confirmed from Tridentine decree, cap. 1, sessio 24, where, when the discussion concerns clandestine marriages and at the same time marriages contracted by children of families without the consent of parents, it is stated: The Holy Church of God has always detested these for just reasons and prohibited them.

It is proven from Civil Law, according to which nuptials are declared invalid when contracted without the consent of parents, as seems expressed in 1. 2 ff., de Si ut proponis, caput de ubi: If children are born, let the consent of parents be had; for this to be so is both necessary according to civil law and natural reason recommends it. And below: If against those things some have come, neither husband, nor wife, nor marriage, nor matrimony, nor dowry is understood. And although these laws are corrected according to Canon Law, as is stated in canon Tu de ac in Tridentino d. c. 1, nevertheless from them it can be understood by natural light the deformity of such marriages. It is proven by three reasons: first, because from such marriages serious inconveniences and scandals arise; secondly, because this requires due obedience to parents; thirdly, because the same persons are grievously offended if children, either unaware or unwilling, contract Matrimony. The second sentiment is this:

to ask for counsel from mortal parents is to be held, but to follow that is not; thus 4 D. 23 n. 10. same title q. 4 p. 17 n. 25 item Vasq.

It is proven in the first part that it is considered a serious contempt to fail to consult parents whose duty it is to look after the welfare of their children; for the father, who possesses greater prudence and experience, can uncover certain matters to his son by which this son may change his will. The second part, however, (which besides the aforementioned recently cited authorities also considers the opinion presumptuously held by the Toledo 6 p. 3 n. 570 and Vigue., explicitly holding it to be presumptuous.) Host. Suarez, Lupus, et Covar, saltem dicunt ibi non esse peccatum mortale, Th. 2, 2° q. 104 art. 5 ubi ait: Non tenentur nec servi dominis, nec filii parentibus obedire de matrimonio contrahendo, vel virginitate servanda. And although the Saintly Doctor there does not speak of a son contracting marriage without the consent of his father, but rather of a father compelling his son to marry, the very reason which he there presupposes is general, and concludes for both cases when he says: A man is bound to obey another man in those things which are to be exteriorly managed by the body; yet in such matters as pertain to the nature of the body, a man is not bound to obey another man but only God; because all men are naturally equal, for instance in those things that concern the sustenance of the body and the propagation of generation.

Wherefore neither are servants bound... and hence it follows as above. The intrinsic foundation of this proposition is that since by means of marriage a man incurs obligation to servitude, reason demands that he be wholly free in contracting it. And although it is according to the law of nature that children should render obedience to their parents, yet according to presumptive law naturally, and with greater force, it is required that entire liberty be observed in marriage. Norwithstanding the texts cited above, those seeking the consent of parents would inquire; for they approve it only on account of decency and honesty, not as a precept, as stated in 24.87 et seq., with Hostiensis at the conclusion of c. fin. Parents, where you should refer to this only in terms of honesty.

The text of Trent is not certain to refer to marriages contracted without the consent of parents, because those very words, that Church of God has always detested, are rather more appropriately referred to clandestine marriages; this seems to be gathered from the subsequent words, in which it says: if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict when understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary; therefore, this Council declares only that it detested

marriages which were prohibited and now renders them invalid. By the same reason, as aforementioned, so much the less do civil laws oppose; and those (as Cujacius and Gessfridus sense at 1. The son of the priest regarding the law in the chapter on your number eight: these marriages did not invalidate them, but rendered them civilly illicit; namely with regard to the effects of the civil contract alone, as Louis XIII declared in his kingdom at Toulouse: if a confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus, if filial children contract marriage without consulting or against the will of their parents, they illicitly contract it, but speaking generally do not commit mortal sin thereby, but only venial sin; thus Palaus p. 12 u. 11.368 n. 9.5 c. 2 § 3 num. 6. Renzi p. 204 q. 2. n. 206 cum Henr. ac satis autem vel per se, vel per alios viros prudentes aliunde valent cognoscere, quae circa id occurrere possunt; e converso parentes nequeunt esse rationabiliter graviter inviti, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. eorum consilium non exquiratur in re, quae absolute pendet ab elec-tione liberorum. Si autem filii non tenentur sub gravi consilio parentum sequi ut concedunt DD. secundae sententiae, non adest ratio cur sub gravi teneantur eos consulere; tanto magis, quia parentes magis se existimant offensos si filii nuptias ineant ipsi invitis post consilium datum quam ipsi inconsultis.

That is all the more valid, if the son judges that his parents will not gravely hesitate to contract that marriage themselves without knowledge. Nimirum filius peccabit minus graviter, si putet parentes in re ipsa libenter consensuros; vel si eos ipsos injuste impedienturos existimet, ut scriptum est caput 11, n. 81 cum Bellarmino, capita c. 24 de sessu 24, ubi conceditur matrimonium contraheri omissis denunciationibus, si fuerit probabilis suspicio quod matrimonium malice impediri possit. Commonly however the aforementioned AA. both of the second and third opinions, as stated in c. Croix n. 570 and the fourth opinion which is held by 14 and Delbene, and Aversa according to c. Croix 1.6 p. 3 n. 570, distinguish; and it has been said that if a confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a

confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, is understood in regard to an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. If parents strive to turn their son away from all marriage with danger of inconstancy, the son is not bound to obey; but if they wish to impede some certain marriage, then it must be considered; if parents unjustly impede, then the son is not bound to obey; otherwise, if parents justly impede, namely if such a marriage shall bring dishonor or scandal to the family, for then the son gravely sins if he does not obey and contracts the marriage. In the case, however, wherein a son could not contract such a marriage without sinning, they say that if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. For this reason, that which pertains to that case shall not obligate him even if he had contracted sponsalia by vow; because since such a promise would regard an illicit thing, the vow cannot be a bond of iniquity; as Rebellius says, p. 21, q. 14, sect. 1, n. 9. Pignat. t: 4. . 9 c. 2 n. 85. item Card. de Laurea, Gab. à S. Vincent. et Opatov. apud ex c. Quantò, de Jurejur. ubi: Juramentum fuisse illicitum, et nullatenis observandum etc. Et clarius ex Responso Alexandri II. apud eumd. 1 ad. 1. id esse verum perjurium, nempe jurare illicitum: Quocumque enim modo quis jurat illicitum, ex hoc ipsa falsitatem incurrit, quia obligatus est ad hoc; et si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. contrarium faciat.

They say that this is true, Tolet. 1. 4 c. 22 n. 2. . 1 D. 32 n. 1 cum Abb, Cov. et Mol. item Syar. et Grass. apud Bona- nov. et D, Th. 2. 2 q. 89 art. 7 etiamsi res juramento promissa esset venialiter mala; et merito, quia iniquitas levis praesumptum est vera iniquitas, cujus juramen- tum non potest esse vinculum. They commonly think that the same should be said regarding the sponsus, namely, that he is not bound to fulfill such espousals despite a grave injury done by parents, even if he has deflowered a virgin; but rather it suffices if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, and it can be confirmed through another three-year period after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is understood to apply to ordinary elections, not supplemental ones. If a confessor is chosen for

supplementation, it can be confirmed through another three-year period after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is understood to apply to ordinary elections, not supplemental ones. Let her be endowed with that dowry, so Valentinian 1. 5 D. 3. 7 tit. 1 q. 2 § 3 dub. 2 R. 2. . 1 D. 14 n. 3 considers this to be most true with. Serious. Graff. et Gob. apud Mazzoch. ex pag. 130 (contra) Ratio, quia virtus justitiae nequit obligare ad actum qui sine peccato impleredi non potest. From which it seems probable to infer that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if such a groom cannot marry an unbetrothed virgin, nor be presumptuously bound to do so: because he cannot compensate for the injury done to her parents with grave harm.

Moreover, granted that a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary. For if such a bridegroom cannot deflower her, he should not be compelled by promise nor seem presumptuously bound on account of defloration to repair a damage that no one can remedy with an excess from his own loss. And whenever the son shall have sinned in contracting an unworthy Marriage, by reason of which a disgrace to the family, or scandals and unfortunate endings may prudently be feared, then they say the Dicast. D. 4 dub. 18. Delbene de secundo decimae nonae caput quadraginta-tertio ac si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Parentes implorare possint auctoritatem Prelati ad tales nuptias implendas et Prelatus teneatur.implere; ideo sicut dicit Bossius ibidem mortaliter peccaret Prelatus si filio faveret vel dispensaret in denunciationibus matrimonii praemittendis. The Doctors agree, as noted by the Author of the aforementioned dissertation on page 36 dub. 1 n. 41, that sons should at least be excused from mortal sin if, without the consent of their parents, they contract marriage out of just cause, and especially I.

If the father prohibits his son from marriage according to the law; thus Bellarmine, de Causis, cap. 19, n. 5i, note 2. Praef. n. 538. cum. II. If he wished to give a wife to her with a dowry greater than she deserves; Bellarm. III. If the father would wish to give his son an ungracious or

harshly conditioned wife; Guttier c. 79 n. 19.

IV. When the son would be unjustly oppressed by the parents; Guttier, ibid. V. Quandò filius à parentibus injustè opprimérétur; Guttier. ib. Si pater procul distet, et filius non posset commode eum certiorem facere, credatque, patrem libenter consensurum: VI.

English Translation: If the father has withdrawn himself far away, and the son cannot conveniently inform him, let him believe that the father will gladly consent: VI. If the father prohibits a just Marriage on account of wanting to lead his son against his will: thus the Author of the aforementioned Dissertation, lib. c. VII. If the father impedes the son from some marriage without just cause; then indeed the son is not bound to obey, and the father gravely sins by hindering, as is commonly said. 4 D. 22 n. 6 with P. Soto: "And furthermore, if a father unjustly impeding his son's marriage incurs excommunication?" Lopez affirms in loco n. 9 from libro 9 where it is said: Under the penalty of excommunication, which they incur themselves by that very act, neither directly nor indirectly do they compel their subjects or anyone else not to contract marriages freely. But they more truly deny it, with Molina, for, as is evident from the context, the Council there speaks only of Lords and Magistrates who compel others to marry.

Moreover, it is more probable to say so. N. 9, sum; An vero dissensus parentum sit per se justa causa solvendi sponsalia? See what is said in no. 877; and whether parents can inherit from their sons who marry against their wishes, or who marry unworthily? See what is said in lib. 3 num. 947 and 948. Question. II. Whether the son is bound to obey his father, rebuffing him, that he may contract marriage, or that he may lead a woman in marriage whom the son abhors? The common opinion rejects that, which they hold: namely, according to D. 23 number 3 with Scotus and Hugo.

Sylv. Soto, Tambur. Ang. 6 p. 3 n. 57o cum Aversa, et aliis passim, ex 2 q. 104 art. 5 ubi: Non tenentur filii parentibus obedire in matrimonio contrahendo. And D. Bonaventura in 4 D. 29 n. 10. By precept, a father cannot marry this or that woman.

Generally however they say c. cum Tolet. Bonaventura. Bellarm. And this agrees with what he teaches in question 29, article 1, part 4: The father cannot coerce the son to Marriage by precept; but he can induce him by a reasonable cause; then the son is congruent to that cause, and thus congruent to the father's precept; but if such a cause constrain by necessity

or by honor, and similarly the precept constrains; otherwise not. But this is to be understood on the condition, says etc., if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be interpreted from the election of an ordinary, not an extraordinary nature; which prohibition, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be interpreted from the election of an ordinary, not an extraordinary nature. The son wishes to choose a conjugal state; unless (he excepts...) some marriage might have been necessary for supplying the need of the parents; but this is to be understood with grains of salt. But Bossius n. 70 says: "Nevertheless, he says better."

Præc. c. 5 n. 22. Cùm Bellarm. et aliis, tantum permittitur patri filium ad nuptias invitare propter aliquam hanc causam, puta familiam propagandi, facultates ampliandi, aut nobilitatem augmentandi. However, Bossius says in the same place, no way can a father compel a son to nuptials if he wishes to choose a better state, namely Religion or celibacy; he also adds in note 71, when questioned. III. ut non notabilis disparitas conditionis aut status inter contrahentes irrite sponsalia contracta? But diligently this question must be discussed, since this case frequently occurs. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; namely, if at the time of sponsals the contracting parties were not aware of disparity, the sponsals are null, provided that the ignorance was antecedent; valid, however, if concomitant; see 5 n. 7.

It is doubtful, if they were already conscious thereof, commonly the Doctors below cited say that they should be held to Marriage; unless (they except) from this there arise disgrace or scandal to the relations, speaking indistinctly in this regard. Sed hoc necessario distingui debet dedecus a scandalum. For if Matrimonium could not be contracted without family dedecore, it would have to be ascertained that a Confessarius is chosen for the supplement; and if anyone is chosen as Confessor for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; then the

sponsi would not be prevented from contracting Matrimonium. Reason: because then the promise is null when it concerns a matter gravely illicit and which cannot be fulfilled without great detriment to the family. Thus commonly: 1. c. 1r. 10 p. 1 c. 1 n. 14. cum de .

Preface, chapter 1, question 3, with 1, 1 Decretals 14 number 3, with Panorm. Preface and let it be said, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be received as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For sponsalia contracted with a person of a different condition per se hold good; yet if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be received as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If Marriage cannot be contracted without family disgrace or great scandal among consanguines, such a promise does not bind, since it regards an illicit matter to which no one can obligate himself. Notandum autem hoc: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Non sufficiat qualiscumque disparitas ad liberandum sponsum a Matrimonio promisso, sed requiratur notabilis, puta si vir nobilis desponsaverit filiam artificis mechanicus, ut ait 18 vel agricolae, ut Busemb, num. 848. v, 4. See what is said in lib. 3 n. 643. But what shall we say if marriage were contracted without dishonor to the family, namely, if the disparity were not in nobility, but only in wealth? In that case, as we said at the beginning, two Doctors assert: first, if a Confessor be elected for supplementarily, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementarity, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously interpreted in relation to ordinary election, not extraordinary; moreover, it does not suffice any kind of disparity to release the sponsus from promised Matrimony, but rather a notable one must be required, for example if a nobleman should betroth the daughter of a mechanic, as said by 18 or an agriculturist, according to Busemb, no. 848.v, 4. Secondly, if a Confessor be elected for supplementarily, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementarity, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor

beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously interpreted in relation to ordinary election, not extraordinary; moreover, the promitter is not held to Matrimony per se; on the contrary, he cannot promise to contract Matrimony if there should be a probable fear of great harm, or capital hatred among the consanguinei.

It is commonly stated in I. 1 D. 14 n. 1 with Molina and q. 1 p. 2 n. 2. Less, 1. 2 c. 18 n. 9. . p. 1 n. 24. . de cum et aliis. Reason for the first part, namely if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The spouse is bound to Matrimony, for although he who promises such an extravagant promise may have sinned, yet he is bound to it, because he promised; if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The spouse is bound to Matrimony, for although he who promises such an extravagant promise may have sinned, yet he is bound to it, because he promised; his own thing (est), and when he has already come to know a better condition, it is reckoned as having exceeded that; for a prodigal promise (as they say) though illicitly made, being nevertheless made and accepted by another, holds good and gives an obligation. This is the whole foundation of this sentence. Cum autem ratio haec pendeat a quaestione, nimirum, an promissio prodiga acceptata obliget, haec prius hic discutienda est.

In ea sunt tres sententiae. The first opinion holds that it binds to the whole; this is held by Lugo in De Just D. 18 n. 6r. c. n. 5. Croix 1. 3. p. 2 n. 795. . item ap. 3 c. 9 n. 27. qui inclinant ad praesumptionem huius sententiae. Reason, because although a promise was made in connection with sin, nevertheless, when he to whom the promise was made has already acquired the right to the promised thing, the execution of that promise, for satisfaction of another's right, escapes lawful and proper bounds. The second sentence, which he considers probable, in c. 3, § 5, n. 20, states: "When Tancred says that such a promise is not obligatorily binding on any part thereof that could lawfully be given; because since the promise was indivisibly made, the entire subject matter evades uninvited."

Third sentiment, which we subscribe to, as Lugo himself acknowledges and teaches, demonstrates that a promissory obligation is bound to the part that is not prodigal, but not to the excess. Accordingly, as Soto and Bann. Prado, Serra, item . . c. in Dec. d. n. 27. qui æquè probabilem putat, et

Croix lib. 3. pag. 1 n. 319. praesumptum probabilem censet. Reason why it is obligated to partake, because the useful is not vitiated by what is useless; and thus the second sense is answered; for hence it is not permitted to promise rashly, because it is illicit to give rashly. Therefore, given that a penitentiary confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be accepted for ordinary election rather than extraordinary, makes the act of prodigal promise principally evil; indeed, such an act cannot itself ever be fulfilled without sin; nor can its execution be dignified by the obligation of the given promise, because no one can bind themselves to perform an illicit thing, as is contained in reg. juris 69. in 6 where it is stated: In wicked promises, fidelity ought not to be observed.

And consequently, the party accepting it cannot acquire any right thereto from the promise itself made, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, and well confirmed thereafter by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood regarding an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. The other party cannot perform it without sin, even if it should be possible to fulfill the act of excessive promise by itself primarily as very evil, and never can its execution be dignified by the obligation of the promised duty; for no one can bind himself to the execution of an illicit thing, as is held in reg. juris 69 in 6: In wicked promises it is not expedient to keep faith. And thus is responded to the reasoning of the first proposition. Hence inference I. 3 q. 7 a. 1 ad. 2. and Palac. ac l. c. de Matr. D. 14 n. 1: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; si quis prodigè aliquid promiserit meretrici pro usu corporis, non teneatur solvere excessum; quia, cum sit promissa res illicita ratione prodigalitatis, promissio nulla est. They rightly infer II. [chapter] with those cited by themselves, that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict is to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For what if some one has promissively offered something unlawfully for use of the body with a harlot very profusely; he ought not to be bound by excess; because, since it is an illicit promise on account of prodigality, there is no promise at all.

Juxià hanc igitur tertiam sententiam, ut ad casum nostrum veniamus,

sponsus prodigè promittens Matrimonium, cum res sit indivisibilis, et promissio tota per se illicita evadat, non tenebitur utique ad illam. It is not hindered if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, and may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The fault of prodigality should not exceed venial sin; for any promise concerning anything whatever ill, even yet remains venially, as for example lying, etc., nor can presumption bring forth any obligation, as they note. And this is certain. Therefore, concerning the conclusion of this point, it seems to me and other learned Juniors (save for the prudent judgment), that the prodigal Bridegroom, who is superior in wealth, should not be bound by Marriage in the proposed case; nor should he, from a reasoning of prodigality, commit a venial sin by contracting such. II. Dicendum hoc procedere, stando terminibus verae prodigalitatis: verumtamen, cum culpa prodigalitatis non sit plus quam venialis, quaevis mediocris justa causa vitium prodigalitatis auferre potest. Hence the groom shall be sufficiently excused for taking to himself a wife who is unequal, if he knows in her some special prerogative, namely of prudence, devotion, great virtue, or of some presumed natural dowry, on account of which he believes that he will lead a tranquil life with her.

Hence it is brought forth that a case may very rarely happen in which the bridegroom would be held not to take her, because seldom has there lacked some cause from among these which would excuse the guilt of prodigality. III. Si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Casu quo sponsus vi promissionis copulam extorserit a virgine vel à foemina honesta, tunc omnino tenere tur eam ducere: quia proditionis virginitatis aut bonae famae res pretio inestimabilis est, quae praevalet aut saltem aequivalet ex cessu disparitatis sponsi; et ideò in eo casu promissio facta est valida, cum jam adfuerit aequalitas in contractu sine vitio prodigalitatis. And this would proceed (according to the aforementioned statement that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not

extraordinary, which states Lugo de Just). D. 12 n. 34.) non solûm cum foemina famam amiserit, sed praesumptum cum se exposuerit periculo famae amittendae. This, however, is how it runs, if the disparity exists merely in riches; for if it exists in nobility, then even though defloweration may have ceased, the man is not bound to marry with disgrace to the family; nor, indeed, is he presumptuously or injuriously liable to harm, as we said in lib. 3, n. 64.

Now this, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is, according to its odiousness and strictness, understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. DD. say as follows, namely, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may fittingly be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when referring to ordinary election but not extraordinary; inasmuch as a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may fittingly be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when referring to ordinary election but not extraordinary. Such a groom cannot then enter into that unequal marriage (understand unequal only in reason of wealth, not nobility with family dishonor, as we have already distinguished), if he reasonably fears harms or the enmity of kinfolk; offering reasons because in that case gravely would the groom offend against charity, and hence, when that marriage then would be contracting illicitly, a promise made to it cannot obligate. And for the same reason it is said in Sauch. 1. c. n. 3 cum cum Lop.) there is no disparity between those who are opposed. I confess that this is indeed a common opinion; and speaking generally, true when a son can easily avoid such scandals of this kind; but if he cannot do so without serious personal inconvenience, it seems to be hindered by reason that, if a confessor should be appointed for the supplement, another three years might adequately confirm him after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against appointing a confessor beyond three years is considered odious and strict in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one; for which reason charity does not oblige with serious inconvenience; hence a maiden is not bound perpetually to remain at home to avoid scandals from men, lest she be long deprived of her liberty; because this itself would be a great inconvenience. If therefore a woman, in order that she may not be long deprived of her liberty, is not bound to abstain for a long time from going out, even though others will suffer scandal; how shall the son be held under mortal sin lest his parents suffer scandal (unless, as we suppose, with dishonor), if he abstains from desiring Matrimony, which he

desires, because of an intense love-passion by which he feels affection towards a virgin whom he expects to lead him to quiet life? All Doctors consider this a great inconvenience; those whom we mentioned in the preceding question excuse grave-sinning sons who enter into Marriage against their parents' will, saying that.

D. 23 n. 10. Escob. de Matr. Dub. 175 n. 723 et Si igitur ob hoc motivum excusantur filii ab obsequio parentibus debito, cur non ob eamdem rationem excusabuntur à præcepto charitatis, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. cum gravi incommodo non obligat? Therefore it seemed more appropriate to me and to other less experienced scholars when . 2 p. 12 n. 9 [it was then considered] that sons should be held under mortal obligation to obedience towards their parents, abstaining from such a Marriage, when they can do so without grave inconvenience to themselves. So much the more, if a Confessor be elected for the supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this reason, they say that if a Confessor be elected for the supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary (as they say).

D. 14 n. 3 et Cæterum, cum hoc sit contra communem, propterea sapientibus discutiendum relinquo. « 7. Resuming culpably from sponsals, he loses his dowry, and is bound to make repayment to the other party, as well as to restore such a contract as he had made up to that point. Hence it must be noted 1. if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can certainly be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood from the ordinary election, not from the extraordinary one; for if a woman promises something to a man that she will marry him, the promise shall certainly be valid, as it is contained in chap. De illis, de Condit. appos., because then the promise is presumed made on account of the dowry. Afterwards, if a man promises something to a woman, and afterwards marries her, then the promise is presumed to have been made for a culpable cause, namely, for the sake of fulfilling lust; thus commonly: 1 D. 33 n. 3 et si id stipulatus, § Si tibi ff. de Verbor. signif. ubi id expressè

habetur. They nevertheless accept the promise, if a man is ignoble or elderly, and a woman is noble or youthful; because then the promise justly compensates for nobility or youthfulness, according to law.

Women C. de Dignit. 853 Notandum II. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. primissio poenae apposite in sponsalibus in resilientem sit illicita et invalida, ex c. Gemma, de Sponsal. quia per hujusmodi poenam Matrimonii libertas læderetur; ità in textu præfato: Cum itaque libera Matrimonia esse debeant, et ideò talis stipulatio ' propter poenae interpositionem sit merito improbanda. Here, the Doctors commonly say that one sins who contracts espousals with this penalty. Others truly say it to be mortal, as Bonac. qu. i p. ult n. 3; and others, however, hold it to be venial, as .i D. 3o n. 2. Coward and Rebel. This however proceeds; if the punishment is imposed by the sponsors, or by their consanguineous relations, or friends, as commonly held n. 65 with Aversa, Lop, and Cornejo.

Not truly if it is imposed by a stranger, as the same authors say in loc. When thus, C. de Spons. The reason is that in the case of a preempted reward, liberty of Matrimony is diminished; hence, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in respect to ordinary election but not extraordinary, allows that the sponsi might incur this penalty so that relatives or friends do not suffer such a punishment themselves: yet otherwise it happened; for when the penalty was imposed spontaneously by outsiders. Furthermore, it must be noted that if a general penalty is imposed upon one who properly withdraws from it, then it is certain to all, that the threat of punishment does not bind but rather asks: whether such a promise of punishment is valid and licit when added to one who improperly withdraws? The first sentiment sufficiently probable denies, and this they hold: 3o n. 2.

And they prove it from chapter L. Titia 134 ff. de Verb. oblig. ubi dicitur: Inhonestum enim videtur, matrimonia, sive contrahenda, sive contracta, metu poenae obstringuntur. Moreover, it is proven from the end of [the text on] Sponsio, where it is said: If caution containing a penalty for the stipulation has been interpreted in both ways, then neither side will have any force, since freedom of power should be in contrahendis nuptiis. They approve the presumption on account of the liberty that would still be infringed; for it could happen that if a Confessor is chosen as a

supplement, he might be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; for a part which justly could resist, would not seek its cause in judgment, and thus, uninvited, might enter into marriage. The second, more probable opinion affirms this, and this is held by Pontius in l. 12 c. 19 n. 8, and by Haunold.

Palaus D. i p. 9 n. 8 cum Leand. et Diana. Rayo, nam sic adiectionis poenae nec adversus jus naturale est nec positivum. Not contrary to nature, because it is per se reasonable to impose a penalty on one who culpably recedes; nor does it hinder the freedom required for Marriage from deterring the spouses from unjustly receding; although laws approve freedom that is rational in Marriage, they also disapprove of irrational freedom; and hence it does not prejudice the freedom of Marriage if someone is chosen as Confessor as a supplement, which can be satisfactorily confirmed through another triennium after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary; for if someone is chosen as Confessor as a supplement, it can be satisfactorily confirmed by an additional triennium after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition regarding non-election of a Confessor exceeding three years, as being odious and strictly to be accepted in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary. Judge compel spouses to contract by means of censures, imprisonment, or pecuniary penalty, in which such fear ought justly be instilled. If a confessor be elected for a supplement, it may be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be received in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; nevertheless, sometimes one might justly rescind and not be able to prove it, this happens by chance, and does not undermine our judgment.

Neither do the aforementioned laws contradict this, for these laws merely irritated the promise of penalty in sponsals to such an extent that it was sufficient for one party to will the dissolution, whether on account of cause or without cause, as is shown in law 1 C. de spons. and Glossa ad ibid.: but according to canon law, chapter Præterea i de Spons., a complete consensus of both parties is absolutely required; at the end of the same it is approved as valid and lawful a penalty for double, triple, or quadruple damages for arrears, which one unjustly resiling has received. Imo Leo Imperator in Novell. 18 (ut videre potest apud Pontium) expressè approbat adjectionem pœnæ in sponsalibus contrà inconstantes, sive injustè resi-

lientes, addens, id esse jam consuetudine firmatum. He questions. II. Whether one who justly dissolves from the nuptials is bound to dissolve the promised penalty, if he has firmly established the promise by oath? The first opinion affirms this, and Lessius holds to this in book 2, chapter 17, number 56, verse v.

Whereupon, Mol. tr. 2 D. 151. 23 et Con. Decretum, caput 22, dubia 5, nota 25. Reason, because although it is a willed promise of punishment, nevertheless its dissolution is not forbidden, which dissolution is owed either by the natural obligation of violence or at least by the oath, according to what was said in lib. 3 n. 177, where it was stated from the chapter "Debitores de Jurejur." an oath obligate, let there be a promise made to be dissolved if the law is in hatred of an unjust creditor, as is the case with the promise of paying usury. The second opinion, however, is more probable and denies this, and holds to that. D. 3r n. 21.

Pontius l. 12 c. 19 n. 7. Bossius c. 11 n. 443 cum et Gutt. Escobar, n. 195, with Bartholomew; Capitulum I. Dub. II.

Of espousals. Eng. and Preface by: Cornéjo, and Dict. The reason is, firstly, because the addition of a penalty against one who justly resists is unjust and hence illicit, and therefore it does not oblige the vow if someone is chosen as confessor for the supplement; it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be understood regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, cannot be a bond of injustice; secondly, because the law prohibiting the promise of punishment does not so much prohibit the promise of interdict, as the solution of the interdict; nor does it so much harm the promise as the solution of Matrimony, by which liberty is impaired. In contractu vero usurario irrita est promissio, non autem solutio usurarum, et ideò promittens tenetur ad juramentum. Question.

III. If the penalty for the betrothal is added and then the agreement is dissolved, the recipient is bound to return it. The first proposition denies this, and they hold it so: 1 d. 3 r num. 2. n. 292 cum Mol. And it is confirmed from a similar principle: if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can be confirmed by another means through a subsequent three-year period after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously interpreted concerning an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. Nor shall he be bound to restore the money won at a forbidden game, although the winner was not obligated to return it. Nevertheless, the second opinion is more probable in affirming this, and they hold this

according to chapter 11 from note 449 with its conclusion. C. de spons., ubi dicitur: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. talis adjectio poenae, ex utraque parte nullivires habebitura sit.

Wherefore, lacking a title, he cannot lawfully acquire that dominion which is dissolved. Nec obstat paritas ludi; nam ibi ideo victor pecuniam recepiens non tenetur restituere, quia contractus per se est validus, et iura tantum praebeant actionem victo repetendi solutum, ut diximus I. 3 n. 887; ac ideo potest victor retinere illud usquedum in judicio repeatur. Nevertheless, however, Palaus with Gutier limits this secondary opinion, unless he who has paid the penalty already knows himself to be no longer obligated; because then it is rightly reckoned as a gift. In doubt however this donation is not presumed, as rightly says Campanus, ff. Oper. liberat.

It queries. IV. Whether a legacy left to a virgin under the condition of marrying some man should be owed if she thereafter marries another? By itself speaking, it is certain that this ought not to be owed, according to 1. Titius § 1 ff. de Excipiendum tamen, nisi alioquin à patre gravetur legitima filiæ debita; vel nisi ipsa inducatur ad nubendum cum indigno; quia tunc conditio illa rejicitur tamquam turpis, et debetur ei legatum, si ipsa nubat alii, exl. Let us see §11 n. 468 with the Rota Romana n. 469 and the Concordat if a girl, in order to obey her father, marry another; because, according to the admitted sentiment which Pontius holds and objects to, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious, strict, and to be received as pertaining to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, does not prejudice the daughter if she marry someone worthy without her father's consent; yet (as we have seen n. 849) it is customary among doctors to expect against decency not to wait for the father’s consent in marriage; and therefore, since a girl cannot honestly marry without her father’s consent, she should not be deprived of a legacy.

But to this it may be replied; if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For

if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary; from this same just cause, namely that she might not lose her legacy, such disgrace would sufficiently excuse her if with the designated person herself were to marry someone worthy. She asks. V. Is a legacy left to a woman, so that she may not marry, to be owed to her if she does marry? See what is said in book 3, note 930 v.

In dubium 7, ubi diximus, deberi, si mulier sit virgo; secundum si vidua. Resp. 2 ubi Tridentinum non est receptum spon- salia jure antiquo transeunt in Matrimonium per quævis signa externa maritali affectu exhibita, v.g. » through copulation. I say, and for this reason it is grievously sinful in them. Hence it follows: Spouses are not permitted impudent contact, since they are already preparing for copulation and pollution; although embraces and kisses may be given as a sign of love. ». 9 d. 47.

See 17 R. 6 et t. 1 misc. R 3i. et p. 4 R 13r. » Whether there be mortal sins in kisses and touches between spouses made for the purpose of acquiring pleasure? (It is said that pudica are certain, and that impudicity is lethal.) There are two opinions present. First opinion, which Saphch. de Matr. hold. I. 9 D 46 n. 37 dicunt, esse tantum venialia, licet adilectatio carnis intendantur, et adsit commotio spirituum genitalium dummodo non sit magna, et absit periculum pollutionis vel consensus in copulam. Reason, because, congruent to marriage, it dignifies the union; thus, the espousals, which are a certain beginning of marriage, dignify such acts, which are a beginning of the union.

Even more so, because through those means love is more fostered towards a conjugal union contrary to hatred. They add that the aforementioned acts may be excused as a presumption from a venial sin, if there be a just cause, such as showing love, gaining goodwill, avoiding ill manners: or preserving the custom of the country. The second opinion is far more probable and entirely to be followed than that which are held by 59 and 6. R. 1. Bonaventura de Mattia, question 4, page 9, and Rebelius.

Croix 1:6 p.3 n. 151 with Mendo and others, and q. 1 a. 7 n. 6 and 7 with Ratio, because the suitor does not acquire any right to the body of the bride through the bond of espousals; and even if perchance he acquires some right through espousals, since he is nevertheless not yet a perfect master of the thing, he cannot use that thing, neither imperfectly; just as he who has been promised the sale of a vineyard may not use it, neither

imperfectly, until the vineyard is actually sold to him and delivered. Furthermore, since it is not permissible for the spouses to engage in copulation, nor are such acts permissible which are ordered solely towards copulation. They nevertheless concede Croix, and with others AA. from themselves added, that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can beneficially be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, allows this. oscula, et 5go Lib. VI. Treatise.

VI. On Marriage. embraces according to the custom of the homeland sometimes may be permitted to betrothed persons: but only after the bonds have been dissolved. And this is probable, provided that such acts are not forced and do not extend for some time, as Roncag rightly observed in his 1st book, who allows presumptuous ones to be admitted to a demonstration of benevolence; but I would not admit them unless the custom were in force, as Mazzotti says in his 1st book. If someone is chosen as Confessor for a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the period of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary one. This is said by Busemburgius in his 1st book, chapter 3, note 43r and Lessius in his 4th book, chapters 58 and 59 with note 15r at the end, that it is not a probable practice because an ordinary certainty of agreeing to venereal delight through the sensitive union will always be present. When considered from this perspective, the first presumptuous judgment is not practically probable; because in such a very unstable matter, any delay would make it impossible to refrain from yielding to acts prompted by habits of voluptuousness, and to avoid consent in either pollution or coitus. An autem sponsis licet delectari de copula futura?

See what has been said in the first part, fifth question, twenty-fourth chapter, where the negative opinion is expressed (contra Bonac. 120 and Mazzot. tom. 4 p. 170. ## DUBIUM III. ## How are sponsals dissolved? They are dissolved I). By Marriage with another. (See the presumption regarding this no. 8y5.) II. By consent given mutually between minors. What if the betrothal vows have been ratified? How, however, are they to be dissolved between those who are not yet of age? What if they themselves have promised marriage by vow? III.

By an interfering impediment suddenly arising. Doubt 1. Is then the sponsalia dissolved by a presumed impediment from the harmful side? 858 Dub. 2. Is it permissible for a criminal to petition for a dispensation? 859 Dub. 3. Whether contracted sponsals with impediment under the condition

of dispensation, by themselves are valid? 860 IV.

By crime of another. Is the marriage contract dissolved through fornication between the spouses? Dub. 1. What if the bride had been oppressed by force? Dub. 2. What if both spouses commit fornication? By a notable change, namely i.

If hatreds are feared, etc. 2. If a harmful defect should occur. 3. If poverty should arise. 86i Is it permissible to contract with an occult and harmful defect? 865 Or with a non-harmful defect? And what if the bride should be questioned as to whether she is a virgin? By withdrawal on the part of another to a distant place. What if for the sake of a friend, with the intention of returning? 867 VII.

By the lapse of the prefixed time. Dub. 1. What, if the duration be two years, has a term been assigned to terminate the obligation? 868 Dub. 2. What if another were justly prevented? D. 3.

If after the expiration of the term, a presumptively culpable party is released from harm. 869 VIII. By Reception of the Sacred Order and entry into Religion. Ninth. By the vow of Chastity. Differently concerning these matters is discussed, and the first [part] concerns Religious Profession. Dub. 1.

Whether by entering into Religion, the betrothals are dissolved before Profession? Dub. 2. Whether the groom is bound to fulfill the betrothal vows before entering the Religious life? 871 On the Reception of Orders. Dub. 1. Would the Spouse sin by accepting Holy Orders, against the unwillingness of the Spouse? 872 Dub. 2.

Does the dissolution of sponsalia occur through the reception of Minor Orders? III. concerning the taking of a vow to enter religion, to receive Holy Orders, or to observe chastity. Dub. 1. Is it valid through a vow of chastity, or receiving holy orders, that sponsalia be annulled presumptuously on the part of him who makes such vows? 874 Dub. 2. What if the Spouse, after the vow, forcibly induced copulation? Again, the question arises regarding the dissolution of espousals through an invalid marriage with another, and it is inquired whether by that very thing the espousals are considered dissolved; presumptively on account of a deceased spouse? 876 XI.

Whether, through a new inheritance coming in? And what if conjugal union were offered much more nobly? Is a disagreement between the

parents the cause for dissolving the marriage? Dub. 1. Whether it is always necessary to have the authority of a judge to dissolve betrothals? Dub. 2. What proof is sufficient in external forum, and what in internal forum? Lib. 352, Dub. 2.

VI. Treatise. VI. On Marriage. 355 By mutual consent, betrothals among those who are not yet of age are dissolved, a presumed oath confirmed by presumption: not only is it valid, but also presumed to be licit, if there is a reasonable cause; otherwise it would at least be venial: thus generally speaking. Qu 2 art 1 n 1. with Con and Guttier. 1. D. 52 n. 8 cum Navar. 12 c. 9 num. 2. cum Mol. et Reb. ac cum . etc. ibid. n. 262.

They say that this is probable according to 1 R. 1 et cc., and they proceed; even if sponsalia are jurated primi-copaliter for God's sake; because an oath made in favor of a third party, although primarily made for the honor of God, always includes a condition, whether another person accepts it or does not remit it according to what is said about oaths 1. 3 n. 193. ex 2 qu. 89 art. 9 ad 2 where it is stated that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict should be understood in relation to ordinary election, not extraordinary; thus an oath made for the utility of one's neighbor can be remitted by him. Case ausadem, quo una sola pars consen tiat in solutionem sponsalium, sponsalia non solvam tur absolute, sed tantum datur jus resiliendi alteri parti juxta communem: vide c. n. 4. 356. Inter puberes vero non solvuntur sponsalia, nisi ipsi fiant puberes ex c. De illis de Despons. impub. ubi dicitur: Cum ad annos pubertatis pervenerit, reclamave rit, judicio Ecclesiæ poterunt ab invicem separari. Upon reaching puberty, each party is able to rescind, by complaining immediately, that is, after three days before a judge or witnesses; otherwise it is presumed that consent was given.

However, this time of three days commences to run from the time, not yet of having attained puberty, but of having attained the privilege of dissolving; for the time useful, given by the Law to make use of the privilege, does not run, unless after the privilege is recognized. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, should not be interpreted more strictly in the case of extraordinary election; if an incompetent person knowing and mindful of his privilege, desiring to rescind, does not immediately rescind, he is reckoned to have consented in his betrothals. If

any confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one; wherefore, if anyone be made confessor for supplementation, it can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one. Hence he who, having become capable of puberty, perceives and adverteth his privilege, desiring immediately to resign, shall not be reckoned as consenting in spousal matters, according to the cited chapter on those: from the words: when he hath reached the years of puberty and hath declared it, etc. For where no time is specified, it is understood at once, as commonly the Doctors understand here, as we said in n. 845, where it was established that this should be due immediately if anyone be made confessor for supplementation, it can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one. If a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary elections, not in extraordinary ones; but that which, if a confessor be chosen for supplement, may fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary elections, not in extraordinary ones. However, let it be understood forthwith within three days, as is proven from 1. fin. C. de Errore advoc., where it says: Incontinenti, id est triduum. It is commonly understood thus: 1 D. 51 n. 14.

Pontifical 1. 10 c. 1 n. 4. Viva I. c. cum n. 213. cum Pichler. They say, however, in Pontius n. 5, that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; but if one of the sponsors withdraws before puberty and persists in such withdrawal, the sponsalia are dissolved when he reaches puberty. If however he has dissentient merely internally, they say. c. and with Sed probabiliùs id negant Conc. pag. 268 n. 3. and Pontius, as well as . cc. cum tum quia, it congrues to the contract nonnecessarie that consent internal alone suffices; nor is an internal dissent sufficient for dissolving the contract. Question Noneautem, an casu

quo impuberes juramento sponsalia firmaverint, possint invita parte resilire in pubertate?

They deny [it], as stated in 136 qu. 1 R. 2 et (as they cite) 1. 1 D. 51 n. 22. They prove it from c. Litteris de Sponsal., where they say that it is expressed to be such. They prove it by two reasons, for the sponsals of youths, being closed by a vow, are valid, although dissoluble; therefore vows are confirmed. But Pontius affirms in 1. 12 c. 9 n. 8, 2 art. 1 n. 3, with Perez, and 9 cum Palud. 1: they consider it probable, because an oath derives its force from the law of the contract, or of sponsals, which (as we have seen) can be revoked among minors. Neither does it hinder the text cited in the chapter, for according to what they point out in book 3, section g, paragraph 4.

VI. Treatise. VI. On Marriage. merit is attributed to minors; and to this judgment also Sanch 1. c. n. 24. with " III." If a diriment impediment should supervene to marriage; Doubt i.

Whether the spousal contract is dissolved through an intervening impediment? This must be distinguished: If the impediment is an effective impediment, commonly and probably San. 1. i D. 56 n. 3. denies that the betrothal is dissolved, unless the impediment comes from a religious vow or a probably presumed impediment of chastity, according to what is said in no. 87.3. Dub. i. The reason is because other impediments do not now exist and do not require a dispensation. If, however, the impediment be a preventive one, it is certain among all (see) that it may be dissolved on the part of the innocent, so that he is not bound to seek a dispensation.

But it suffices for dissolving the sponsalia on account of such impediments, that there be a rumor thereof, as he well notes in 2 art. 7 num. 4 ex c. Cum in tua 27 de ubi: Si non est manifestum, fama tamen loci hoc habet, etc. Nevertheless, for this it is requisite there be a rumor and not merely a scandal: a rumor exists when opinion of the impediment is present among the greater part; a scandal suffices where the lesser part is concerned: scandal pertains to the lesser part. But it is uncertain whether then the sponsalia are dissolved even presumptively on the part of the injured person? It is affirmed by Dict. lib. 10, D. 1, dub. 38, that they suppose it to be probable, namely, that given such an impediment, the marriage has already become impossible. They commonly and probingly deny it, saying that since it is not right that the one who sins should gain advantage from his own crime, according to c. de Trans fat. Prelate. But 358 Doubt. 2.

He who has imposed an impediment is bound to obtain a dispensation, or

to receive the offered one? Others, as c. 2 n. 72 says, are not bound even if espousals were betrothed, unless thereby bound is rendered for reason of damage incurred, namely defloweration or reputation made foul; because the promise is understood to have been made: with things remaining in the same state, according to c. Quemadmodum de Jurejure; furthermore, because no one is held by law to withdraw himself through dispensation. Others, however, as p. 26 n. 4. with Ochag. ac etc. say, to hold him still bound, after the incurred damage has already been suffered, to seek a dispensation together with diligence and expenses, which commonly occur for such a dispensation, even if they were great ones. Reason: because every man is bound in a manner such that he can restore another's right if some Confessor be chosen as a supplement, this may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict when it comes to ordinary election but not extraordinary one. For himself unjustly he has injured by opposing an impediment. Others indeed more probingly, according to .i D. 56 n. 4. 2 art. 7 n. 3.

Wigandt tr. 16 n. 22. cum Gutt. et (cum communi ut asserit; dicunt, teheri quidem praesumptum secluso damno illato, si dispensio facile posset impetrari; secus si ad eam requirerentur magnae expensi ac longa mora; quia obligatio orta ex sponsilibus urget Sponsum ad apponenda media tantum ordinaria et facilia, non autem difficilia et extraordinaria. Sporer however takes exception 1: c. cum : because then it would have been incumbent to incur a great expense; but not so much as to be compelled to decide against one's own standing. Uno autem qui habeat votum castitatis teneatur ducere virginem defloratam sub promissione Matrimonii: et an teneatur petere dispensationem qui sub promissione Matrimonii violaverit consanguineam? See the aforementioned [work] 1: 3 nn. 649 and 650. Doubt. 3.

Si sponsalia sint contracta inter habentes impedimentum dirimens, sub conditione expressa, si Papa dispensaverit; impletas conditiones, validae sunt sine novo consensu? See what was said 1:3 n. 650 where we held an affirmative judgment with Lugo 12:7 n. 1 and Bonaventure. D. 1 p. 7 n. 10. For although true sponsalia do not exist before the condition is fulfilled, they nevertheless introduce an absolute obligation to await the fulfillment of the condition; hence the consensus persists according to §§6 Lib VI. Treatise.

Sixth [Chapter]. On Marriage. Concerning the fulfillment of the condition. Hence it is inferred; if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may beneficially be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor

beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Let it be presupposed that these sponsalia conditions do not induce an impediment to Public Honesty; yet if the Bridegroom were to contract Matrimony with his Sister, he would still sin; and these second sponsalia would be null, since there is a promise of an unjust thing, which does not obligate, as they correctly say and as the Pontifical law 7, chapter 36, note 7 states with the decree. S. C.: "IV." By the severe crime of the other spouse are dissolved from the part of the innocent; which is considered to be such as fornication, whether spiritual, like heresy: or corporal, both of the spouse and of the spouse, after betrothal, and the presumed engagement of the spouse before those, although effected by force, being unknown to the spouse.

Bonac, part. 8. Nisi vero sponsa permittat se tangi impudicè ab alio per oscula et amplexus, potest sponsus resilire a sponsalibus; sed non vice versa, quia, etsi sponsus id faciat, non est dedecus sponsae, nec mutatio alicujus momenti. R. 283. * (Praesumptio ita est . i. D. 55 n. 5 et et ll. cc. cum aliis citatis) nisi talia oscula et tactus sint ita frequentes, ut indicent valde propensum animi sponsi in alteram, ut merito timeri possit ne sponsae sit fides servaturus. Si autem uterque sponsus fuerit conditus post sponsalia, nec neutrum posse resilire dabit propter incertitudinem prolis. c. R. 284. 2.

Great theft, great homicide, etc. or similar, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. great damage, or infamy, may it produce. 86i. Si fornicatio fuerit antè sponsalia, certum est apud omnes posse virum cognita fornicatione Sponsae post sponsalia eam relinquere. On the contrary, a woman cannot dissolve espousals on account of fornication committed by the Spouse before, which another had previously indulged in, as commonly taught . i. D. 63 n. g.

If not, the Pontifical also limits Pont. 1, c. 18, n. 2 and n. 88 with) If not, the Pontifical also limits Pont. 1, c. 2 cum Con. et . Si vero fornicatio fuerit post sponsalia, certum est quod Sponsus mulierem relinquere potest, si ipsa voluntariē fornicata sit. But there is doubt whether a man can withdraw from the betrothal, if the Bride has been forcibly subjected to fornication? Armillia, Tabiena, Rosella, et alii negant apud Quia (ut ajunt), cum ipsa culpa vacaverit, non est suo jure privanda. But commonly and more truly they affirm . 1.

D. 55 n. 7. Pope 1. 12 c. 17 n. 3. and Co轩 Anthony, Wetland. Soto, and

from c. Raptor 33. And the reason is because the Spouse, through such oppression, though without her own fault, notably becomes more vile; hence notably are changed the circumstances, to be discussed further in note n. 863.

Dubium. 2. an, utroque sponsu fornicante, utroque liceret resilire? There are three opinions. The first view, which is held by the Second opinion, as the second article states, paragraph 2. Goodness. D. 1 p. 8 n. 6 cum et Perez apud Ratio, quia congruent post Matrimonium contractum; si uterque conjux adulteretur, né uter potest petere divortium ex c. 6 de Adulter.

If both Spouses commit fornication after the engagement, neither can dissolve the marriage. The third opinion however is more probable and common (as he himself confesses in . 12 c. 17 n. 3. 1.). D. 55 n. 9. Renzi p. 345 qu. 3 et Diana, Ratio, quia in hoc non dariä æqua compensatio, cum longe turpior sit forniciatio Sponsæ quàm « « V. If a notable change occurs or is discovered, which if known from the beginning would have dissuaded from the betrothals; * (Ità comm. . 1.

D. 63 n. 2. The pontifical law book, book 12, chapter 6, note 18. And this he says in 2nd part, 6th article, §4: even if the copula intervenes, then it is sufficient to compensate for the damage; see what kind it was; e.g., I. inimicitia, vel odium grave inter Sponsos; quò referetur asperitas, vel sævitia post sponsalia priùm cognita: item justus timor, ne ex matrimoni scandała, et gravia odia nascantur inter parentes, vel consanguineos. Si alter uter iucidat in lepram, paraly- sim, morbum gallicum, etc., si graviter multiletur, ut amissione oculi, nası, vel aliter graviter defor- metur, præsertim sponsa, vel sponsus reddatur ine p- tuus ad opificium exercendum, vel acquirendum » officium ad sustentationem familiae necessarium.

» 4. R. 85. . 1 d. 57: 8. cit. * (Italian comment.) » all with D. 43 art. 3. And this and that—» if indeed there is no certitude concerning such a defect, but merely (however prudent) suspicion, as Pontius 1: 12 » c. 17 n. 4 and) * Nevertheless it is not held » spontaneously to open such defects, which make the marriage less desirable indeed, but not pernicious, Cap. I. Dub.

III. Concerning Marriage. Especially if some infamy be attached to it (for example, if the bride by violence or spontaneously had been corrupted); still, however, directly contrary is posited and effected by word and deed, not counterfeit; he can also lawfully dissimulate when questioned and contract Matrimony. Si vero defectus sint perniciosi, v. gr., morbus

contagiosus, gravis infamia, sive personalis, sive generis, aut familiae, non licet etiamsi post sponsalia contracta in eos incidit, contrahere cum eorum ignaro nisi si medius defectus ipse patiatur. Part 5, treatise 4, contra Pontifical: he infers that after sponsalia have been broken by corruption, a bride can be coerced by hidden defects of this kind into standing to the sponsals and contracting Matrimony.

III. If the debt of the other party is discovered to be great, or if there is a grave danger concerning fortunes, reputation, poverty, sickness, etc., or if the Bride is unable to bring the promised dowry, or finally if the Groom begins to wander about inconveniently for the Bride, then Bonac. I. c. Item Sporer n. 282. 1. Distinction 59, n. 2 et 4, ac Pontificalium libros 12, caput 17, n. 8 cum Conciliorum. Reply and the dose, as they say, is either promised or not promised.

And they also say: "cc. if fear arise that the Father will exhume the Son.) If a confessuator is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a confessuator beyond three years, being odious and strict, is to be taken so regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. But if the deficiency of the Spouse is detected, and the Spouse doubts whether he would have contracted it from the beginning, then if that defect is reckoned grave and notable, it shall be presumed for the Spouse, who will thereby be free to withdraw. Distinction 65 secunda si the defect is slight." Bard. l. 6 c. 11 p. 7. Question None, whether the laboring part, on account of a hidden defect sufficient to dissolve the dowry, is bound to manifest it before the dowry is dissolved, or after the dowries have been contracted and before Matrimony? To be distinguished from what is common: If a defect would render the marriage pernicious, such as infamy, leprosy, French disease, or some other contagious illness, he is bound to make it known or to withdraw from the marriage, unless the other party labors under the same defect; thus, P. l. 12 c. 18 n. 6. c. 2 n. 99 cum Diana 3 p. 400 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Sixth. On Marriage. trans. 4. R. 287. . whatever they may say . 1. D. 58 n. 8 et alii apud Ratio, quia congruent peccat contra justitiam qui alteri vendit merces noxias credenti bonas, ita à fortiori qui cum pernicioso defectu vult Matrimonium contrahere. Si vero defectus non redderet nuptias noxias, sed tantum minus appetibiles, nempe si Sponsa esset pauper, quae reputatur dives; ignobilis, qua nobilis; deformis, qua pulchra: corrupta, qua virgo: tunc sit ipsa non possit virum decipere fungendo se immunem à tali defectu, tamen non tenetur defectum manifestare, sed potest etiam interrogata dissimulare æquivocè respondendo; tunc enim non fugit, sed occultat vitium occultum; ita.

Pope Innocent III: Decretals, Book I, Title c., and Regulations in Practice, Title 7. Renzi p. 437 q. 10. Cross n. 182. with c. 2 n. 97. with Dic. and Avers. with Hurt. et Leand. (contrary to Ochag. ibid. n. 322. et) Reason, because it is a custom already received that there be no obligation to declare such defects; and because nobody is bound to proclaim his own defect when it would entail his own infamy unless he does not injure the right of another; for although the Spouse has the right to dissolve the betrothal upon discovering such a defect by opposing an exception on account of such a defect, until she herself opposes the exception, she can be compelled by the Spouse to marry congruent adulterer, so long as the man does not oppose the exception on account of the known adultery; thus he may claim his debt from him. Wherefore the aforementioned authors say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election, not for extraordinary one. For even if the Bride is corrupted by another, and is asked by the Groom whether she was known to have been corrupted by another, she can conceal and deny through a restriction that is not purely mental, responding that she has not been corrupted, implying in common estimation or to open it unto thee; moreover, he adds that this impediment prevents the man from discovering her corruption. They nevertheless receive 1.

Sporer n. 286. Pontifical decree of the sixth day and Croix number 183 with Con. and Peréz, if the Spouse having been kept in concubinage with another is pregnant, because then there is a danger to the Spouse's detriment, namely if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it might well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious, strict, and to be received in reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, ought to nurture an alien offspring. They receive 12. Pontifex: Ibid. Regula 7. Croix n. 184. et cum tunic enim dicunt, teniari Sponsam vel suam violationem propalare, vel a Matrimonio desistere; quia tenetur ex charitate erga Sponsum, et praesumptum erga seipsam talia damna praecavere; Sed huic objici posset, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. charitas hon- videatur obligare cum tanto incommodo, nimirum vel ae infamandi, vel remanendi semper innuptam; vide dicta n. 851 v.

To that, however. To see however, what causes are sufficient to discharge the obligation of spousals, attend to these two rules. Firstly, as regards supervening causes for spousals, that cause suffices which, if it had been foreseen, would have prevented the contracting of spousals: for a part remains free from them, which did not give rise to these new causes; thus commonly 1 D. 62 n. 3, and with Aversa, Lidd. Henry Dictum est et aliis: Ratio, quia sponsi sub hac conditione censentur obligari, nisi accedat notabilis mutatio, qua praevisa minimè contra xissent.

Second rule, for unknown previous causes to sponsalia, that suffices which, if it were to supervene, would already be sufficient for dissolving those; thus in Pontius 1:12 c:18.1 D 63 n. 2. and with Dic. Aversa; thus to Pontius 1.c.u.4 and with Troll. 402. On Marriage. "VI." If one party departs for a distant land without the consent of the other; because it is deemed to renounce its right. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict, as to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, if the Bridegroom transfers his domicile elsewhere; or if he departs for a distant region although with intent to return, the Bride can immediately proceed to other nuptials; this is expressed in c. De illis, 5 de spons., where it says: He who promises by an oath of fidelity that he will marry some women and then, unknown to them, forsakes the land and transfers himself elsewhere, shall be free for his wives to transfer themselves by any means. Si vero sponsus discessit in propinquum locum cum animo redeundi, tunc si discessus fuerit ex causa necessaria, puta infirmitatis aut alterius gravis nugotii, statutum est in lib.

Sepè de Sponsal. expectandum esse negotii finem; si autem ex causa voluntaria, quando discessus fuit intra Provinciam, dictur in 1. 2 C. eod. tit. expectandum esse ad biennium; quando extra Provinciam, ad triennium ex 1. 1 C. de Repud. They commonly say, Saph. 1. 1. . 2 art. 3 n. 2. 2 c. 2 num. 61 cum Et hoc dicendum (ut ajunt . . cc. cum Pelez, contra Bonac.) etiamsi discessus fuerit ex causa necessaria. But they say better, Palaus p. 23 n. 2. Pontius I., c. 12, n. 4, cum Canisio: in hoc mihi Jus Civile Canonico correctum fuisse; nam in dicta c. De illis sermo fit tantum de eo, qui domicilium mulavit, non autem de illo qui discessit reversurus; Verum recte addunt: neque in hoc statuendum esse Iurj Civili, quia praefate leges terminum statuunt non ut Sponsa possit spon-salia dissolvere; cum (ut diximus n. 853). I. those who once sufficed according to Civil Law, by the will of one Spouse for dissolving the marriage contract; but as the Bride set forth, let her dissolve it by cunning and deceit.

Whereupon we conclude with Saint Anthony 3 p. t. i c. 18 § i eod. Pont. l. c. n. 62. cum Con. Reb. et Dic si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. semperac spon- sus discessit in propinquum locum, expectandum sit, donec redeat; vel requiri debeat Spousus, ut intrà certum accedat ad contrahendum Matrimonium: Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. si ille requisius reditum justa ex causa differat, vel erit expectandum ad prudentis arbitrium, ut dicunt . c. et cum Conc. cc. ac . On the same matter teaches Benedict. XIV. when Anac.

Cler. Holy See on the 2nd. October 1723. which equally responded thus regarding how to act. These, however, arise if there is no set time prefixed for going to the marriage in the betrothal; for if a term has been assigned, see what should be said in sequence n. seq. VII.

Si sint inita cum conditione, certo tempore contrahendi matrimonium, liberatur obligatione is, per quem non stetit, quominus sit contractum. When a term is annexed to the espousals, it must be considered whether it is annexed with intent to urge or to render unbreakable the obligation of contracting marriage, or rather with intent to terminate such obligation. Then it is applied to solicit, when the parties themselves anticipate the term, so that neither before that time can coerce the other to fulfill the contract. But then for terminating, when the term is set, so that no obligation remain after its expiration. And these must be so observed, if the parties agree thereto by express words.

But Doubt. i. If the words are ambiguous, when should the term be considered attached to solicit the obligation, and when for completion? It is answered according to common opinion, two rules are assigned in such a doubt. First: If the terminus is prefixed from one side only, and negatively on the other, then it is considered appended to solicit the obligation; but if from both sides, then to conclude. Second: Si terminus apponitur antequam sponsalia contrahantur, censetur ad finiendum; sequis si post sponsalia contracta; ità 1 D. 43 n. 3.

Ronç. p. 137 qu. 3 R. 2. Renzi p. 435. q. 3. et cum 12 c. 16 n. 3. dicat, praefatas duas regulas non esse genericiter verae. In casu autem, quo

terminus est ad finiendum obligationem, elapsu tempore ex culpa unius partis, alia innocentium liberatur, etiam si sponsalia fuerint jurata, ut commune est apud omnes cum. D. 27 q. 2, art. 3, ad 2, et patet ex c. Congruent 22 de Sponsal., ubi Pontifex præcepit imponi pœniientiam cuidam sponso, qui recessit à sponsalibus cum quadam contrectis, et nuptiæs cum alia invit: Nisi (addidit) juramentio suo certum terminum præfizit, intrà quem dictum P. duceret in uxorem, et per eum non stelit, quia ad statutum terminum Matrimonium consummaverit. Therefore, if he did not hinder it, it would have been licitly withdrawn. 563 Doubt. 2.

An elapsus terminus ex defectu v. g. If yes, could the bride dissolve the betrothals, if the unworthy one had omitted to contract matrimony justly through fault, hindered by impediment? The first sentiment denies it, and this is held by Pont. 1. 12 c. 16 n. 4 . 2 art. 3 n. 3 et . 1. D. 53 n. 7 cum n. 16 item Gutser. apud Trull, apud Ratio, quia non est equum, ut priyetur jure suo, qui ex justa causa im- peditur à promissis adimplendis, ex l. 1. C. de Annal. except u ubi: Tempus non currit legitime impedito, utjure privetur.

This is proved by the presumed authority of the cited canon; but the aforementioned text more truly proves the opposite, as we shall see shortly. But Bon. and cc. with others note that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood differently concerning ordinary election compared to extraordinary; thus, so that an innocent part may be released from sponsals, morally it ought to be such that, upon examination of circumstances, prudently each such thing can accordingly be considered as reasonably culpable of mortal sin. Item advertit Pontius, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si ob tale impedimentum unius partis diutius differatur Matrimonium, bene poterit altera adire Judicem, ut, monita parte impedita, alium terminum praefigat, quo elapso ipsa omnino libera remaneat. The second opinion is more common and probable, and this is held by Conink. D. 27 d. 6 n. 47. n. 57.

Response 2. Reason, because the end is appointed for this, lest a part that

is prepared remain long without marriage, otherwise time would be unnecessarily wasted. This aulem sententia clare probatur ex praedicto textu in c. Congruent, quem spereram ad suam sententiam adversarii detorquent; Casus enim (ut diximus) ibi fuit, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Vir quidam post sponsalia contracta cum una, contraxisset Matrimonium cum alia; hinc Pontifex decrevit, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si per ipsum stetit, quominus cum prima nuptiae initae fuissent intra terminum praefixum, debuisset agere poenitentiam. Wherefore from the text accordingly it was declared: if a Confessor be elected for a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in respect of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one. And that, if a Confessor be elected for a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in respect of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one., if it did not stand thereby that, since the first marriage had been begun within the prefixed term, he ought to perform penance. And hence, if it did not hold (understand this culpably, for otherwise no penance would have been imposed upon him if there were no fault), that a Marriage contract was entered into within the defined time with another, it licitly might be contracted after the lapse of the term with another. Therefore, if it was licit for him to contract Matrimony with the second party, since he culpably did not fulfill the statute time for the contracting of the first nuptials, the Pontiff supposes, that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, which, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. He himself remained completely free from the obligation of sponsals after the lapse of that term.

Hence it is concluded, if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary one; because, when the prefixed term expires, entirely ceases the obligation of sponsals on that part which was already prepared for marriage. But Doubt. 3. A parte contracta matrimoniali stipendi postulata, subsistat exempta a obligationsibus illis pars presupposita, qua reum suscepit dilationem? The first common opinion denies this, and states that only that part remains free which did not stand firm; thus, Pont. 1. 12 c. 6 n. 4. Conclusion 6 number 47.

Psalm c. 2 n. 55. and Decretum d. 53 n. 7. with Palud. Gom, etc.' Rato, quia nemoigitur, alterà negativè se habente, tunc censetur ap-positus ad sollicitandum; si verò ab utraque, ad fi-nendum. Second: If the term is annexed before sponsalia are contracted, it is considered for finis; but if after the sponsalia have been contracted, thus 1 D. 43 n. 3. 3 R. 2. Renzi p. 435. q. 3. et cum 12 c. 16 n. 3. dicat, præfatas duas regulas non esse genericiter veras. But the one who is cast off, to whom the term has been apposed for the purpose of terminating the obligation, after the lapse of time through the fault of one party, renders the other innocent, even if the sponsalia have been sworn, as is common among all.

D. 27 q. 2 art. 3 ad 2 et patet ex c. Congruent 22 de Sponsal. ubi Pontifex præcepit imponi pœniientiam cuidam sponso, qui recessit à sponsalibus cum quadam coïpractis, et nuptiæs cum alia invit: Nisi (addidit) jucamato suo certum terminum præfixit, turbà quem dictam P. duceret in uxorem, et per eum non stelit, quia ad statutum terminum Matrimonium consummaverit. Therefore, if through him it was not fulfilled, lawfully he would have withdrawn. q. 2 d. 3 dubit. 2. If after the lapse of time through some defect, e.g., If, even though she has been engaged, a bride could retract from the betrothal, if the one who ought to have entered those nuptials has culpably omitted to do so, lawfully detained by impediment? The first senletitia denies it, and on this point the Pont. 1. 12 c. 16 n. 4 . 2 art. 3 n. 3 et . 1 agree.

D. 53 n. 7 cum n. 16 item Guttier. apud Trull, apud Ratio, quia non est equum, ut prius jure suo, qui ex justa causa impeditur à promissis adimplendis, ex 1. 1. C. de Annal. exceptu ubi: Legitime impeditio non currit temporis, ut iure privetur. This is proven by the presumed evidence from the cited c. Congruent; but the aforementioned text truly proves the opposite, as will soon be seen. They however note Bon. et alii cum aliis, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it may well be confirmed by

another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, so that an innocent part may be freed from sponsalics more reasonably, such that, having considered the circumstances, it itself is deemed rightly culpable of mortal sin. Moreover, Pontius observes, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, serves that an innocent party might be released from sponsals; more reasonably ought it to be so much that, considering the circumstances, it itself should be judged truly culpable of mortal sin. That if on account of such impediment one side were long delayed in Marriage, properly another could approach the Judge, so that the hindered party may set a different term, by which elapsed she altogether remains free.

The second opinion, however, more common and probable affirms this, and Conink holds this. D. 27 d. 6 n. 47. n. 57. R. 2. Reason, because this end is set forth, that a part prepared may not remain long unmarried, otherwise time would be idly wasted. This very proposition is clearly proven from the aforementioned text in c. Sicùt, wherewith I hoped to pervert the adversaries' own argument; for (as we said) there was a case there, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood with strictness and odiousness in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a certain person contracted Matrimony after betrothal with one, he had entered into Marriage with another; hence the Pontiff decreed that, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood with strictness and odiousness in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. But if it had stood through him that the first nuptials were begun within the prefixed term, then he should have performed penance.

Wherefore from the text accordingly it was declared: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. That which being said, if someone were to choose a Confessor for

supplementation, he could be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict it is to be understood with regard to an ordinary election, not extraordinary. But if per se it did not stand (meaning herein that he acted culpably; otherwise, if there had been no fault, no penance would have been imposed), that marriage contracted within the defined time could lawfully contract another after the lapse of the term with another. Therefore, if it was licit for him to contract Matrimony with the second woman, since he culpably did not keep the stipulated time as regards the contracting of the first nuptials, the Pontiff supposes, that if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition of not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood concerning ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. For what pertains to him himself, he remained completely free from the obligation of sponsals upon the expiration of the term. Hence it is concluded: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., cum terminus praefixus elabitur, omnino cesset obligatio sponsalium ex parte illa, qua jam parata erat ad nuptias. But Doubt. 3. An, elapso termino in sponsalibus appositio, remaneat libera ab eorum obligatione praesumptum pars, quæ culpabilem apposuit dilationem?

The first common judgment denies this, and says that only the part by which she did not stand remains free; thus Pont. 1. 12 c. 6 n. 4. Concil. Decr. 6 num. 47. Psalm 2, note 55, and Decretum 1, 53, note 7, with Palud. Gom. etc. Ray, quia nemo debet ex suo crimine commodum reportare. It is certain among all, with the Pontiff 1, c., and if a Confessor shall be chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being as odious, strict, and to be understood as the prohibition of an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one. For if both parts had stood firm, that no marriage might be celebrated within the prefixed time, both portions of the dowry are dissolved by both sides.

The second opinion asserts that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the term of

supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, if through either party it stood so that the Marriage might not be celebrated within the prefixed time, both parties remain free, assuming the guilt which was: thus Ronc. holds at p. 137 q. 3 R. 2 at the end, and he expressly holds this assumption in 27 q. 2 art. 3 ad 2 where he says: If through him it stood so that a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can fittingly be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Matrimonium non est completum; debet agere potentiam de peccato fractae promissionis aut juramenti et contrahere cum alia, si vult, judicio Ecclesiae. Reason seems to be, because when the term is appended to an obligation finiem-dam, upon its elapsing the obligation ceases; for as the term is intrinsically apposite to the contract, by its deficiency the party remains free; nor does it hinder if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, which can be confirmed through another triennium after the supplement's time has elapsed, because prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strictly to be observed in ordinary elections, not in extraordinary ones. Then he repays according to his own fault, for the law of the contract regards the defect of condition rather than culpability, as stated in Reg. jur. at 6: "Constructed from a condition, the law accedes to those deserving." The first opinion is indeed much more common, and far more probable to me; but this second one does not lack for probability, especially by the authority of D. Thomas. « VIII. They are dissolved, although they are ratified, through acceptance of a sacred order, or entrance into another religion, or a vow to enter. Nor does it hinder if he later renounces the society, as is taught in 1 d. 24, even though Præpositus.

Let it be filled, and let others suppose that on their part prior betrothals bind them so as to undertake compensation for any damages caused by the engagement, whereby they could not enter religion if they had deflowered the fiancée, nor otherwise than through marriage could they compensate for the damage. V. Diana page 3, title 4, rubric 207. Bon. 1. c. » IX. It is probable that a presumed debt be paid by a simple vow of chastity, as some teach; although this regards a better good: even though it teaches otherwise, Fill.

And others say that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict as it is to be received in regard to ordinary election,

not extraordinary, since if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict as it is to be received in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Deus non acceptet promissionem rei alteri promissae, et in alterius praedictio. Whereby one is accustomed to be compelled in the external forum, such that either he keeps the faith, or enters the Religion. In the meantime, after such a vow, the other party is given the jus sponsalia to be redeemed; and if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years following the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; hence, if someone who has vowed shall recede, and renounce his vow. See Bonacin. pg. 6 num. 13.

Hence, it must be distinguished between the Profession of Religio-5, sacramental reception of Holy Orders, and the Vow of Religion, whether of Orders or of Chastity. And I. As regards Religious Profession, there is doubt whether entrance into the Religion of one Spouse dissolves spousal contracts contracted before Profession? There are three sentiments. The first assertion states that through entrance into religious profession from neither side are the espousals dissolved, thus CoV.

Durand. in Ratio, quia congruenter matrimonium ratum non per ingressum, sed tantum per professionem dissolvitur, ut ex c. 2 de convers. conjug. ita dicendum est praesumptionis de sponsalibus; sed haec sententia non videtur satis probabilis. The second opinion is more common, to which I adhere, and which 2: 148 hold with, when it asserts together with the common usage, Croix n. 187. Pontius 1. 22 c. 10 n. 4. with Reb. and with Con. Perez, et Henr. ac cum Gonet, dicit, tunc dissolvi sponsalia tantum ex parte manentis in saeculo, tum quia alter ingrediendo Religionem censetur cessisse juri suo; tum quia ex ejus parte tunc accedit notabilis mutatio, cum dedecori aestimetur nubere ei, qui 'Religionem deseruit; Non autem dissolvi ex parte ingredientis, si postea ad saeculum redeat; quia per ingressum ipse non redditur inhabilis ad contrahendum Matrimonium, congruent redderetur per Professionem. The third opinion, which is held by 1. 1 D. 42 n. 2 and 5. 7 c. 21. c. 2 n. 20., states that sponsalia may be dissolved on the part of either party.

The reason given for the first point is that just as novitiate is congruous with Profession, so are sponsalia congruous with Matrimony; accordingly, just as Matrimony is rendered voidable by Profession on the part of both parties, as is declared in canon 2 of "De Convers," so are Sponsalia

rendered voidable on the part of either party by Profession. Spousal union thus through entrance. But to this reason a reply is made, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be received in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary; such privilege by Divine Law (as declared by the Church) is conceded only to Religious Profession as an institution of perfection; but if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be received in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. through entrance into sponsalia. thus solved, no right is held: and truly it would not be just that he who retrogrades from it should enjoy the privilege conceded to the Religious institution. Reason for this decree is, because entrance into Religion with intent to persevere already dissolves the vowener from the vow of Religion, so that if later he should attempt to exit Religion and find it unequal to his powers, he may already be free from the vow: much more therefore does it dissolve the obligation of sponsals, which is a lesser obligation than the vow of Religion. But this reasoning does not persuade, for he who makes a vow is thereby freed from the vow through the entrance into religion because he has already fulfilled his obligation; for a vow is understood as made with the condition that if religion suits him: But on the contrary, the Spouse by entering into religion in no way fulfills the obligation of the sponsalium; and therefore, if he emerges from it later, he justly remains burdened with the same obligation.

Here the second sentiment appears to me more absolutely probable. Doubt. 2. whether, if espousals be a confirmed vow, the Spouse is bound to celebrate Marriage before entering into Religion: The first opinion affirms this, and the Scots uphold it in their tenth chapter, note ten; and they also prove this accordingly. Commissum. 16 de spons. ubi dicitur, tutius esse, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Eo casu Sponsus prius nuptias ineat, et deinde ante consummationem ingrediatur Religionem, si ve- lit; en verba textus: Tutius est ei (Religione jura- menti servata) prius contrahere, et posted, si elegeri, ad Religionem migrare. The second

however, very common and appropriate judgment, being more correct in speaking, denies it, and Ptolius holds this, n. 13. 1 D 43 n. 3. namely 4., and 2 art. 4 n. 5. Holog. n., 24a et Salm. e. 2 n. 18 cum Dicast.

Reason, primo quia sacramentum semper habet conditionem, nisi status perfectior eligatur; secundo quia sacramentum sequitur naturam contractus, ex c. Quemadmodum 25 de Jure-jurando, ubi dicitur: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quern si aliqua causa fecisset jurare, ut se cum muliere contracturum propter supervenientem fornicationem vel deformitatem repellere possit; si ergo sponsalia nuda non obligant ad Matrimonium contrahendum ante ingressum in Religionam; nec praesumptum obligant jurata. The aforementioned authors rightly respond to the opposite text, stating that if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period following the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, pertains more to ordinary than extraordinary election. For this reason, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period following the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year term, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, pertains more to ordinary than extraordinary election. In that case, because the bridegroom was not definitely determined to enter but merely desired to do so, as expressed there, therefore, the Pontiff said that every man must contract marriage first and then, if he wishes, may enter religion; hence, if the bridegave not completed the previously specified time, and had already entered religion or deliberately resolved to enter before completing it, doubtless no valid marriage could be contracted with grave fault arising, as they rightly observe in 7. c. Pont. 1. 12 c. 2 n. 2 cum: 11 cum contra Cajet. et . I said, speaking per se, namely, as Bonac. co.: ac Pont. d. c.. 10 n. 13 cum adduce rightly: that if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, it can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as strict and odious in ordinary elections, not in extraordinary ones. The bridegroom should be considered to celebrate marriage before entering religion, if this were necessary for legitimating offspring, repairing scandal, or providing honor appropriately, otherwise it could not be avoided. And in this case, even a presumptuous act is not permitted to the spouse after the celebration of marriage to enter religion, and to leave that unconsummated; for then it would be wrong to desert the wife, who on

account of infamy could not otherwise dissolve those nuptials, as rightly noted at 4 num. 65. v. Wherefore: II.

By reason of the reception of Sacred Orders, it is certain that presumptively the sponsalia are dissolved, but not the ratified Matrimony; thus all with regard to this. Diatribae 47 numeralis rubrica Pontificia 1. 1 caput 11 numero 2. et patet ex Extravagantiis. According to the ancient decree of Voto, where it is stated: Although a solemn vow, through the reception of sacred orders, may be deemed efficacious insofar as it impedes marriage, nevertheless it is doubted whether one who receives Sacred Orders insidiously or unwillingly is considered a Sponsa? The first proposition affirms that there is a grave sin committed, and they hold this. C. N. 3, 2, 6 p. 3 nu. 200 cum Concilium et ad rationem. non ordinand. The second opinion, however, which is no less probable, denies this, and that is held by the Pope 1. 12, c. 11, n. 3.

Consensus, de capite sexto, numero 6, caput 26, cum Aversa, Diana, et Henr., ac et Vega. Reason, because in the promise brides are always inhibited as a condition, unless a better status is chosen; for it is unjust that the status to be called Creator should be hindered from saying this to His creature to be served. Nor does the contrary text obstruct this, for there non so much is considered the prejudice of a third party as the infamy of the Church, as is expressed there; whereas in our case no prejudice would be inflicted upon anyone, since the Spouse uses her own right. This appears to be confirmed by the same Extravagant cited above, according to which only reception of Sacred Orders is prohibited after marriage has been contracted, but not after espousals. Dubium. 2. Utrum per susceptionem Ordinum Minorum dissolvantur sponsalia?

The first opinion affirms that which Tanner and Gob hold, namely, both because such is the change in the bridegroom when he is initiated to the Minor Orders, so that it is justly deemed that he did not wish to be bound to nuptials with him intended to be contrary; and also because the bridegroom is reputed to yield his right when he receives a state ordained to the Major Orders, which are incompatible with Matrimony. However, the second opinion is more common and more credible in negating this, and it is held by . 1 Wigandt tr. 16 n. 29. Pope 1. 12 c. 11 n. 1. n. 234. Reason, because truly the status of Minor Orders per se is not incompatible with Matrimony, since one can rightly become a Cleric married, as is apparent from chapter 1 and On the Clergy Married. III.

Regarding the vow of entering Religion, or of receiving Sacred Orders, or of observing Chastity, it is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the

time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious, strict, and to be taken seriously in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, whoever promises to enter Religion may lawfully promise and should enter, nor is he bound to observe betrothals, if he truly desires to become Religioso; for if he departs [from this vow], he is held accountable, as we have stated above at n. 870. It is certain with 2 Cum . 1 D 46 n. 5 and D 47 nu. 4. Pont. 1. 12 c. 12 n. 4. 4 et 5. . 2 art. 4 n. 8. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be duly confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. If, however, one after espousals makes a vow not only of entering but also of presumptuously profiting Religion, then the espousals shall be dissolved on both parts; for he who makes such a vow becomes altogether unfit to contract Marriage, as they correctly say in n. 29 and article 4 at the end. But Dubit. 1 whether by reason of the vow of preserving Chastity, or of receiving Holy Orders, are dissolved the presumed sponsalia on the part of the one who makes the vow?

If the vow precedes the sponsalia, it is certain that it be rendered invalid, because their promise, since it concerns an illicit matter, does not obligate; hence there is doubt whether it shall follow afterwards. The first opinion denies this, and this is held by [references omitted]. Article 4, note 8; Decretum 46, note 9, and D 47, 3, with Saint Anthony. Arm. Sylv. Because nos. 232 and 235.

Reason, because God does not accept a promise made to another for whom it was promised and accepted, nor is it held by any right if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, thereby can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary, would have sponsalial vows dissolved by these promises. They do not prevent the text from the chapter "Venientes." Whoever cleric or vowed person, where a case has been, if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strictly to be received in ordinary election, not extraordinary, that certain women have contracted sponsalia with him about whose cruelty it has been told; afterwards being deterred, she made a vow of chastity; whereupon hearing this, a man entered into Matrimony with another. Alexander III consultatus: respondit: Mandamus quatenus mulier qua licentiam nubendi petierat si plus non

processit sibi de fide mentita et voto violato congruam satisfactionem indices et ei cui voluerit nubendi in Domino licentiam tribue non postponas. These doctors from either side of the opinion bring forward this text for themselves, but truly it concludes neither for nor against any part.

The authors of the second opinion, whom we shall presently enumerate from those words, infer from a violated vow... and to grant permission, etc., that the aforementioned vow was valid, and therefore a dispensation was required; hence, as they say, it suffices with a simple vow of chastity, since it is valid. Thus, they annul the espousals. But to this rightly they respond: and by these very words. Vota violata, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. hoc nihil aliud probet, nisi si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. votum satis esset validum respectu ad nuptias cum alio contrahendas, quas mulier intentabat; et ideo Pontifex ipsam declaraverit ream de voto violato; sed minimè probat, validum fuisse respectu ad virum, cum quo prius sponsalia contraxerat. The second opinion affirms this, and the Pontiffs affirm it in lib. 12 cap. 11 n. 3 and cap. 12 n. 4. It will be fixed. 2 de Voto c. 4 n. 15. 11 c. 21 q. 10 cum Rh.

Eng. and Magd. Guilt. Henry and the Prelate. Lop. l. i D 46 num. 7. qui vocat probabilissimam et communiter probabilem vocant et tutam Cabass: l. c. et Eamque absolutè docet . q. 53 art. i ad i: Propter votum simplex sunt sponsalia dirimenda. The reason of the holy doctor is; because where duties converge under leadership; the more preferable one should be preferred.

Another reason, different from the one commonly taught, is that the promise of betrothal is considered always made subject to a condition, unless a better status be chosen. They say that this is valid, even if the betrothal vows had been sworn, because (as has been many times stated above) a vow follows the nature of the contract. And it is also found in the Decree Deoisio issued by the Sacred Congregation on March 5th, in the year 1701, where it was stated that a vow of chastity, or even the suspicion of Holy Orders, through the choice of a better state, invalidate betrothals even those confirmed by a vow. They do not deem it fitting to amend the aforementioned text in the chapter Veniens, where it is said concerning a lie of faith, from which the Adversaries argue that a woman illicitly vowed chastity through contracted sponsalia; for the Pontiff, loco

citato, no. 5, responds probatively. Thus the Pope said that it concerned the external forum; for although the vow was secret and the sponsalia public, this was evident concerning the latter, but not concerning the vow; whence it deserved to be reckoned as pertaining to the external forum that faith had been violated.

Item respondent dixerit de fide mentita, non quia voverat in præjudicium sponsalium, sed quia in fraudem ipsorum, nec ut sponsum eluderet, et deinde nuberet alteri per dispensionem voti, quam jam petebat. Both opinions are probable. Nevertheless rightly he says: Item more probabili dicuntur . n. 33 cum sed non omnino improbabiliter D. 56 n. 8 hoc negant; quia per votum priora sponsalia omniùsolvuntur; unde, cum illa obligatio omnino sit extincta, per dispensationem voti non reviviscit; et huius rei consensu praesumptum Concilium loc. cit., quamvis addeat: tenendi de honestate sponsum ducere desponsatam ut scandala et murmura vitentur. 8:4 Dubit. 2. ad quid teneatur vir, qui vovit Religionem Ordines vel Castitatem et postea mulierem cognovit sub promissione Matrimonii? See what is said in 1.3 n. 649, where we held that, since from easy possibility both obligations are bound to be fulfilled. But they deny 5 n. 36 and . and Candido apud . c., that then the obligation ceases, or is entirely suspended, when in truth it cannot then satisfy both obligations, and the obligation of entering into marriage prevails (as we said).

In contractu tamen Matrimonio, eo casu non poterit vir petere debitum; et ideo recte subdit: adeoque dispensationem obtinendum esse ut praesumptum petere valeat. 8:5 « X. By a Valid Marriage, betrothals are dissolved at least as far as regard him who has not contracted marriage; but as far as regards he who has contracted it, the obligation is not extinguished if the other expects it, but is suspended, and that prior betrothal be fulfilled upon dissolution of this marriage, teaches Pope in contra. See R: 209. It is questioned whether by means of a subsequent marriage all previous engagements are entirely dissolved? It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood as referring to ordinary election rather than extraordinary one; for during Marriage after betrothal with another contract, their obligation ceases, according to c. Si inter de spons., et c. 1 de spons. duor.

It is doubtful whether, upon the dissolution of the marriage through the death of the spouse, the obligation of prior sponsalia should be enforced? The first opinion denies this, and this is held by numbers 25 and 241 with Bec. It is a doubt whether, upon the death of the spouse, there urges the

obligation of prior spousal promises? Henry... 1. 1. D: 48 n. 3 cum Palud.

Manual. Bonaventure who says thus: "An engaged person, and anything more than a mere engagement, are no longer bound by marriage." Reason, because an obligation once extinguished never revives according to the chapter. What you inquire about, but the second sentiment is more absolutely probable for me, and this is held by the Pontiffs, lib. 12, cap. 13, n. 4. R. 1. To the objection and reply thereof, as well as to Leand.

Vega, and others. Reason, because no one justly approves it, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious, strict, and to be received in reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which entirely irritates the sponsalia by subsequent marriage: neither by positive law, because nowhere is this found: nor by natural law, because the obligation of sponsalia during Marriage with that person initiates, does not obligate for that one at that time, and therefore it is suspended but not extinguished; as is clear in him who consummated Matrimony after Religious Vows, for here he, being left widowed, would remain bound to fulfill the vow. It does not hinder to say that when Nam responds, nothing refers, if a Confessor be elected for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strictly to be taken in regard to ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones; for which reason the subsequent obligation does not necessarily annul the primary one: only the condition of the subsequent bond must always be attended to. If it is perpetual, then certainly the first obligation is extinguished; if rather it is temporal, it is suspended until the bond ceases to exist; as in the case where someone sold an animal to one person and afterward to another, and the animal happened to return into the ownership of the former owner, it would certainly be held that he must deliver it to the buyer for the price received, as is concluded from L. 15. Code of the Matter Sold. XI. Si ad sponsorem nova hereditas superveniat, ita ut illi sponsa jam sit in aequilibre, non habet ideo jus.

"resiliendi; quia non est deceptus in conditione;" Sponsae, in qua nulla facta est mutatio." It is the same regarding the bride if a new inheritance should come to her. R. 286. So Bonaventure and his contemporaries commonly hold. D. 59 n. 7. 8 v. some, and Leander and Ochameg. among them.

But according to the first opinion, as Croix says number 160: if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another

triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, should be understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary one. If someone has contracted betrothal with one woman, and afterwards marriage is offered to him with another more wealthy, he cannot then leave the first, for there was no change made in that regard. But si the quality of the second Spouse were exceedingly better, I would not dare to condemn entirely the Spouse; if he wished to contract with her; for it is allowed in this case that the status of the Spouse or of the spousals does not change; whence the Spouse would not be bound to observe them without great damage to himself; and it would not seem right either to bind him to observe them, when a great gain were lost; such an loss being equivalent to a grave damage, according to law one, chapter three, number thirty-one. And thus I find that many Theologians in such cases have understood the words of Vita Sancti Joannis a Capistrano c. 9, even though St. John himself was opposed to such a sentiment, from which indeed I would never dare to deviate or consult otherwise. 37. It is asked as a supplement to this point, whether the dissent of the Parents is a reason for dissolving the dowry? Affirmant Menochius apud Croix n. 101.

And thus all those who suppose, t. 4 p. 413, and adduce, the dissent of the parents to be a true impediment hindering Marriage, should consider it presumptuously. But commonly they deny this very thing himself Croix l.c. with Gab. Sauch. l.c. D. 14 n. 7. praesumptum cum communi, c. 11 n. 106. They say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not for extraordinary. For the sponsal contracts of children from this alone arise if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not for extraordinary. Let them be initiated without the consent of the Parents, nor may they be annulled, because their consent is not required by necessity, but only by honor according to Canon Law. They nevertheless receive [permission], unless a great scandal be feared from such a Marriage, when if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, he can conveniently be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For the virtue of justice cannot oblige to an act which cannot be fulfilled without sin; thus, c. v.

For indeed, and c. n. 3. when from there with Lob. it is valid, even though there be no disparity between the contracting parties. However, they themselves caution that this scandal should be carefully considered, for frequently (as they say) menaces and dangers of discord are vaunted, which afterwards, according to experience, cease easily where marriages have been contracted. But returning to what was sought, I deem it advisable that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict when referring to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the Father dissentients unjustly from such a Marriage, the Son cannot receive from the sponsalia, and both the Son as well as the Father would be sinning if they wished to dissolve it. Contra vero, si Pater justè contradicat, scilicet si Matrimonium vergeret in dedecus Familiae, tunc illa sponsalia non obligant, cum nemo possit obligari ad exequendam rem injustam. And the same is said by l.c. with others commonly, if many scandals arise through such a marriage among the relatives.

It is presumptuous (to add that a son may dissolve the sponsalia, if the father justly menaces disinheritance): and I submit, presumptuous if unjustly, because all sponsalia are understood to be contracted (as we said in n. 863) under this condition, namely, if such a change does not come about, whereby it would gravely burden to contract Marriage. Accept, unless this excommunication has already been made known, because then the contracting party is considered to have lawfully ceased from his obligation by right. « Rosp. 2. In the aforementioned causes, when a new inheritance supervenes concerning the bride, if themselves. Reply 286. Thus commonly do Busemb. understand it.

D. 59 n. 7. 8 v. some, and Leander and Ochrogau, among them. But according to the first opinion, as stated by Croix number 160, if a confessuator is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessuator beyond three years, given its odiousness, strictness, and being interpreted for ordinary election rather than extraordinary, applies. If anyone has contracted betrothal with one person, and afterwards marriage is offered to him with a more wealthy other, he cannot abandon the first one, because then no change has been made in that [relationship]. But si the quality of the second Sponsa should be exceptionally better, I would not dare to damn utterly the Sponsum; if he wished to contract sponsalia with her; for it is permitted in this case that the status of the Sponsa or sponsalia does not change priori; wherefore the Sponsum ought not to be held bound to

perform those sponsalia with great damage to himself, nor could it seem fitting to hold him so bound, when through a great loss; such loss being equated to a great damage according to law 1, book C., number 301. And so I find that many Theologians in such a case understood the words of Vita S. Joannis à Capistrano c. 9, although St. John himself was adverse to that very sentiment, from which indeed I never would dare to depart or consult. It is asked as a complement to this point, whether the disagreement of the Parents is a cause for dissolving the dowry?

Affirmant Menochius apud Croix n. 101. And thus all those who say it, according to volume 4 page 413, ought to suppose it presumed, and he adds, that the dissent of the parents is a true impediment hindering Marriage. But commonly they deny it, himself Croix ibidem with Gabriel. Sauch. l. c. D. 14 n. 4 Holz m. p. 167 et 287, cum communi, ut testatur . 368 n. 9. praesumptum cum communi, c. 11 n. 106. They say that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, which would mean that matrimony contracted for the children's sake on this sole ground, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, that the consent of the parents may be initiated without their consent, nor can they be hindered, since their consent is required not out of necessity, but only for honesty according to Canon Law.

However, they receive permission unless a great scandal is feared from such a marriage, in which case if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict as it is considered regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, that consent of parents concerning nuptials should not be required by canonical justice except for the sake of honor. For indeed, Holz m. n. 167 et 266. ac. c. n. 3. cum ib. cum Lob. valere, etiamsi nullà sit disparitas inter contrahentes. However, they themselves do admonish that this scandal should be cautiously considered; for it is frequently (as they say) that menaces and dangers of discord are vaunted, which afterwards, according to experience, easily cease where marriages have been contracted, and animosities are reconciled. But returning to the sought-after point, I hold that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another

triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, rather than extraordinary, for if the Father unjustly dissents from such a Marriage, the Son cannot receive from the sponsals, and both he himself and the Father would sin if they wished to dissolve it. Contra vero, si Pater justè contradicat, scilicet si Matrimonium vergeret in dedecus Familiae, tunc illa sponsalia non obligant, cum nemo possit obligari ad exequendam rem injustam.

And the same is said: Locus citatus cum aliis communiter, si ex tali Matrimonio magni scandales sint origo inter propinquos. It is presumptuous (to suppose that the son can dissolve the sponsalia, if the father justly threatens disinheritance): and I subjoin, presumptuous if unjustly, because all sponsalia are understood to be contracted (as we said in no. 863) under this condition, namely, if such a change does not come about, wherefore it is grievous to contract Matrimony. Receive it, unless this exhaeration has already been declared, because then the contrahent is reckoned to have lawfully ceased according to his right. « Resp. 2. In the aforementioned cases, when manifest sanctions are in place, there is no necessity for the authority of the Judge to dissolve the sponsalia; otherwise, it is required. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the spouse, knowing his right to dissolve, nevertheless carnally has known the spouse, he is deemed to have tacitly renounced his right and to have ratified the sponsalia.

Dubium i. Is it always required an authority of the Judge to dissolve a marriage? Resp. Semper requiritur auctoritas Judicis ad solvenda sponsalia. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If, however, a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict, should be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus Sanch, 1. i D. 69. n. 3. If sponsalia are public and the cause is public

and certain, no authority of a Judge is required; similarly if sponsalia are secret and the cause is secret. Pont. 1. 12 c. 18 in fine et n. 1. cum Sylv.

It is certain 2 that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. If the cause is doubtful either by law or fact, altogether an authority of a Judge will be required. But when sponsalia are public and the cause secret, then a presumed authority of a Judge requires, but not under grave fault unless a grave scandal might arise; Pontius c. 18 n. 8. . c. with n. 6. c. because if that cause did not place before a Judge for approval nor even required an assumed authority of a Judge under light fault, as Palud. et Hanr. says. In a case however, where the defect of the other party can now be proved but is hidden, the innocent party should inform and threaten; for if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, is not so in extraordinary election. If such a cause has a doubtful status by law or fact, complete authority of the Judge is required. When however sponsal contracts are public and the cause secret, then presumptive authority of the Judge is required but not under grave fault unless great scandal be feared; as it is said with Palud. et Hanr. Dubium 2: Quæn probatior requiratur ad solvendas sponsalia? Distinguendum: Si agitur de probando impedimento, sive vere dirimente vel vere impediente, tam foris quàm interni, sufficit una testis iurata - tus, exc. Supersede the judgment from Test. e t, Attest. et some testis illius criminosus, et non citatus, sed a parteductus; et sicut sic lam deponat, et in manifestationes suae nominis: ita. i D. 7 i. n. 2. 3. et 4. . 2 art. q n. i.

Cross n. a15 et 217. . 32 n:3. cum Gutt.: et cum Aversa, et Goninc. And this, even if the espousals have been sworn to as more validly held . 8 with Aversa and Gabr., whereas Palud and Lop: ibid. n. 5 assert otherwise: because an eyewitness witness is more probative than fame, which certainly suffices to dissolve espousals made by a presumptively sworn oath; see the discourse on this point n. 997. Dub. 2. If however it concerns a cause to be proved, which is not an impediment, but merely what gives another the right to seek recourse, such as deformity, fornication of the

Spouse, etc., according to external forum, at least two credible witnesses are required to depose under oath, as some say and is more commonly held, namely Laym, c. 2 n. 12. And it is also said that two witnesses are required where a prejudice of a third party is concerned. But it is said that one worthy witness suffices, Palud. and Aversa say (who add that).

And indeed this opinion seems to me sufficiently probable; speaking of the sponsal impropriety, when it is a matter of the perpetual bond of Matrimony, and therefore on account of such suspicion the husband prudently judges to fear lest an unfortunate outcome arise from this marriage. And to this very sentiment they themselves explicitly consent, saying that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, given the probable fear of an unhappy outcome, thereby a man may licitly recede from sponsals. As regards the internal forum; the Doctors agree with [the opinion] of [Pope] Honorius I: Decretum 1, chap. D, sec. 73, no. 2. Croix n. 215. cum Gobat. et Salm n: 108. cum vel praesumptum opinionem probabilem de causa sufficienti ad solutio- nem, ut idem 1 D. 69. n: 9. Croix n. 217. 420 Lib.

VI. Tract. VI. On Marriage. and Article 2, Section 9, Note 1. From this they infer: when Lopez says ibid., if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be beneficially confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strict in the case of ordinary election but not extraordinary, which, if a learned man affirms to be sufficient cause, the innocent party can lawfully withdraw.

HEAD II. ON MARRIAGE IN ITSELF. DOUBT I. What is that which constitutes its Matter, Form, and Minister? What is Marriage? And in what consists its essence? What is the matter of the Sacrament of Matrimony? For what end is marriage licit? Three ends are distinguished.

Dub. 1. Is it licit to marry principally as a remedy for concupiscence? Dub. 2. Does it pertain to extrinsic ends? How shall consorts sin mortally together? What is required for a contract of Marriage by Proxy? If he who gave the mandate without the intention of contracting, before Marriage is contracted, ratifies the mandate, what then? What kind of consent suffices for the contracting thereof? What if one contracts it falsely? Are words necessary for validity? 888 Are they necessary from precept? 889 Is a donation of a ring, or the translation of the Bride sufficient to contrahendum? 890 Is consent sufficient condition patutis? 891 What if

the condition is necessary, or turpitudinous against the substance of Matrimony? 892 What if a condition is appended, if the Father has consented?

Dub. 1. What if the father remains silent? Dub. 2. What if the father initially dissented and afterwards consented? 894 Dub. 5. What, if at the time of the condition the father was dead? 895 An after fulfillment of the condition, a new consent is required. 896 In what respects the condition differs from Demonstratio, Causa, Modo, et Die. 897 DISCOURSE on the Minister and Form of Marriage. 898 Objections are resolved. 899 Conclusions drawn from our opinion. RESPOND. It is a sacrament among the baptized, by which "a man and a woman mutually lawfully give each other their bodies." Chapter II.

Dub. 1: Concerning Marriage in itself. They (the sacrament) are expressed to a perpetual society of life, for the use and procreation of offspring, and as a remedy against concupiscence. The matter from which it proceeds and that immediately prior is the mutual consent extended through express signs, so far as it has the reason of tradition. Forma autem est idem consensus, qua- teuis habet rationem acceptationis. . 3 d. 2 s. i. art. i. But Matrimony is said to be ratified when the contract has been made, even though the carnal union may not have followed; whereas it is said to be consummated when the union has actually taken place. Matrimony is said to be conferred by the gift of the Mother, as says St. Thomas, or so that she may become a Mother, as says St. Augustine. Before the advent of Christ, Marriage had only the force of a contract; but afterward, through Christ, it was elevated to the nature of a Sacrament.

Of faith it is, that Matrimony be a Sacrament, as defined by the Council of Trent, Session 24, Chapter I, from that Epistle (To the Ephesians 5): This is a great Sacrament; but I speak of Christ and the Church. Wherefore Matrimony, as Sacrament, signifies the spiritual union between Christ and the Church. In Matrimonio, ut habente rationem tum contractus, quam Sacramenti, tria considerantor, nam contractus, vinculum perpetuum animorum cum obligatione reddendi debitum, et copula carnalis. This diversifies the text, even though two others to the same order say otherwise, namely no, it is an essential part of Matrimony, for Matrimony can well subsist without copula. Therefore, the essence of Matrimony in the reason of the Sacrament consists in the contract, namely, through a very great consent, because the Sacrament, when perfected with the contract, produces Grace.

In ratione verò Matrimonii propriè dicti, ejus essentia consistit in vinculo conjugali, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit

confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. num- quàm per se solvi potest. It is asked what is the Matter, and the Form, and who are the Ministers of the Sacrament of Marriage? The sentiment is confused, that the ministers of this sacrament are themselves those contracting it, and that the form of their words expressing it follows, which we shall demonstrate in a brief dissertation appended at the end of this doubt, according to n. 897. As regards however the Matter, the Doctors more readily dissent; listing six opinions he cites from Liber secundus, libri quinti septem Pontificalium eodem titulum, liber primus caput septimum. Nevertheless, two are however more accepted.

First, as Busembatt maintains as stated above; and in c. n. 6 and many others among them, it is said that the words of the sponsors, so far as they express the tradition of the bodies, are matter; whereas, so far as they express acceptance, they are form. The second opinion, to which I adhere more closely, and which is taught by St. Frassen: t. 12 p. 139. Conclusion 1. Abelly page 200 question 1. Learn from Larenz and P. Soto, as well as Pontius in Book 1, Chapter 7, with St. [and others], it is said that the matter remote from this Sacrament is the bodies to be mutually handed over contrahentium; namely, a loan of bodily substance; the proximate matter is itself the handing-over of the right in the bodies made by words or signs expressing consent; but the form is the acceptance of the loan expressed by words or signs.

Of the Form we shall speak below, as we have said above. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it may be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition concerning the choice of a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary and not extraordinary election; but if remote matter be bodies mutually contracted, and proximate matter be itself the mutual tradition of bodies made through words or signs expressing consent, thus is it proved. This Sacrament according to common opinion has a reason of contract, and therefore in other contracts is the remote matter, the explicit consent by words is the form. And the tradition of the thing is the proximate matter of the contract, namely the application of the form to the remote matter; thus in Marriage, the bodies (or right in bodies), are the remote matter: the explicit consent by words is the form: but the traditio juris in corpora is the proximate matter, which is brought about through the application of the form to the remote matter, namely to the jus, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a

Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be received in election ordinaria, not extraordinaria. The contract of Matrimony elevated to the reason of this Sacrament has a special characteristic: if a Confessary is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be observed, pertains to ordinary election, not supplementary one. For thus, distant matter being corpora contractantium, and proximate matter being the mutual tradition of bodies, this is proven. However, for the contract of Matrimony, corpora (or jus in corpora) are remote matter: consensus expressed by words is form; but the tradition of law regarding corpora is proximate matter, which results from applying form to distant matter, namely to law, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be observed, pertains to ordinary election, not supplementary one. For thus, distant matter being corpora contractantium, and proximate matter being the mutual tradition of bodies, this is proven. However, for this reason, dominion over the law concerning contracting parties is transferred, and real tradition of thing is not required as in other contracts, Chapter II. Dub.

I. Of Marriage according to itself. 42§ but it suffices that the external will alone be expressed, as teach St. Ambrose in De Insit. Virgin. c. 6, ubi: Non defloratio virginatus facit conjugium, sed passio conjugalis. And Saint John Chrysostom. Homoïēm. 32, in Matthaeum: Matrimonium non facit coitus, sed voluntas. « 1.

It is valid and licit to contract a marriage with a pact excluding procreation and nutrition, without any intention of offspring. The reason is because it does not conflict with the essence of marriage. And it is evident from the example of the Blessed Virgin and Saint Joseph. The ratio is, because it does not conflict with the essence of matrimony. And this is evident from the example of the Blessed Virgin and Saint Joseph. It does not seem licit to contract merely on account of carnal delight or vanity: because even the end should be at least honorable.

Sanch: Book 2, Question 29, Article 3. 3. It is permissible to contract in remedy for concupiscence, intending nothing else, provided that proles positively does not impede: for this under penalty of mortally it is not permitted: Con. d. 25 d. 2 n. 16. Pope's book 1 chapter 21. Hurt.

Perez » death. 18 section 7 note 6 from reply to question 7. Hence also spouses can abstain from conjugal use, and wish to receive fewer children

than they can nurture, so long as positively they do not impede this, nor procure an abortion. Perez l.c.: Licitly etiam contraetur ob fines honestos trinsecos, fini intrusivè co Sacramenti (qui est mutua animorum conjunctio et conjugum sanctificatio), non contrarios; v.g., ad pacem inter regna, vel illustres familias componendam, vel splendorem familiæ conservandum. Thus contrary to that. » 219.

V. 6 n. 7 ubi cum . c. etiam permittit ob divitias et nobilitatem. V. 6 n. 7 where even also permits, on account of riches, and nobility. Legally valid but illicitly contracted is the marriage when there is an intention to deny the debt, to avoid offspring, or even not to educate, to commit fornication, etc., unless such an intention is brought into the contract as a condition obliging to something contrary to the essence of matrimony. And invalidly is contracted the bond of matrimony, who wishes it to endure only for a year, or reserves for himself the power of adultery, or does not repay a debt due properly exacting it. V.

Perez s. 6 etc., l.c. he conservat sibi potestatem adulterandi vel non reddedi debitum debité exigenti. V. Perez s. 6 etc., l.c. 882 Tres fines in matrimonio considerari possunt: fines intrinseci essentiales, intrinseci accidentales, et fines accidentales extrinseci. Intrinsic essential ends are two: mutual tradition with an obligation to render a debt, and an indissoluble bond. Intrinsic accidental ends are likewise two, the procreation of offspring, and the remedy of concupiscence.

The extrinsic accidental ends may be many, such as reconciling peace, yet when love for procreating offspring is not decreased in an act of commixtion, but pleasure is sought there. Having set these points forth, it is certain: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, pertains to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If anyone should contract [a marriage], positively excluding intrinsic substantial ends of Matrimony, namely not intending to fulfill debt or to contract for a term, not only would he sin, but he would incur no Matrimony; thus generally all with. D. 3i q. i art. 3. It is certain 2. if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood odiously and strictly concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if anyone exclude two intrinsic accidental ends of Matrimony, namely, that he may not render debt or contract for a time, not only would he sin, but he would not contract Matrimony at all; thus generally all together with. The virgin with S. Joseph, who certainly did not intend procreation of a progeny nor

remedy of concupiscence, and yet validly and lawfully entered into a conjugal union, according to 20: Noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam. Dubitatur i.

Does one commit a venial sin by marrying primarily for the remedy of concupiscence? The first sentence affirms and this is maintained in St. Thomas Aquinas, Commentary [on the Sentences] c. 22 n. 9. Natal. . 3 reg. 3. p. 303 n. 5 Henr. et l. i. Doctor 29 n. 26. They prove it from the authority of many SS.

Fathers. Furthermore, they prove by reason, because although the remedy for concupiscence is presumed to be an honorable end of Marriage, Chapter II. Doubt. I. Of Marriage according to itself. However, the primary end is nevertheless procreation; hence it is against the order of reason if someone should be chosen as Confessor for supplementation, and can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood strictly with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. The secondary end should therefore be chosen before the primary one.

The second opinion, no less common nor less probable, denies that this contrahens in any way sins, so long as it does not exclude the end of procreating offspring; thus hold the Palaus, p. 10 n. 3. R. 2. Croix 1. 6 pag. 3 n. 236. 1 c. 21 n. 4 cum P. Soto, etc., item Caj. Major, Durand. 1. 9. D. 9 n. 3.

And this, if any Confessor be chosen as a supplement, can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary; which they say concerning Brides, and the same thing assert concerning Spouses who have copulation chiefly for tempering concupiscence. The reason for this sentence is, because Marriage was instituted by God not only for procreation of offspring, but also as a remedy for concupiscence, which is proved from Apostle 1 to 2, where it says: On account of fornication let each one have his wife and let each woman have her husband. Hoc tamen respondet textui sic dices: Si aliquis per actum Matrimonii intendat vitare fornicationem in Conjuge, non est aliquod peccatum, quia haec est quadam redditio debiti... sed si intentio est ut vitare fornica- tionem in se ipsum; ibi est aliqua infirmitas; et secundum hoc est peccatum veniale; nec ad hoc est Matrimonium institutum nisi secundum indulgentiam, quae est de peccatis venialibus. But the interpretation of so great a Doctor (to whose sentiments I have

studied to conform in all other matters) seems more appropriate that of St. John Chrysostom, whose words I shall quote shortly below, and followed by Estius, Salmron, and Corncius: namely, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict it is understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. This, that if any Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict it is understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. this is intended on account of fornication, but not of that which should be avoided in the Conjugial relationship; rather of one's own: and this seems evident from the context of the same Apostle in chapter 7 verse 1 and 2, where it is said: It is good to avoid touching a woman. But on account of fornication each shall have his wife and each her husband. Inquit, quomodo Apostolus viris consilium praebeat ut abstineant a tactu mulierum; si vero ipsi in periculo sint incontinentiae, ne incidant in fornicationem, remedium non solum permittit, sed suadet, dicendo: unusquisque suam uxorem habeat. Et quaecunque adjungit: Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, non secundum imperium.

He moreover proposes this for those who are not incontinent, to whom he permits marriage but recommends abstinence from nuptials, saying: I however speak thus to widows and bachelors, it is good for them if they so remain, and I concur with this. Neither does this indulgence imply permission for a venial fault; rather (as the Pontiff with Estius says), when D. Paulus directs his discourse to those who are in danger of incontinence, not only does he permit them, but he encourages them absolutely to marry, saying: "I say then, that it is good if such remain unmarried, and I also approve this." If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition concerning not choosing a confessor beyond three years, since it is odious, strict, and to be understood as pertaining to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, if they do not contain themselves, let them marry; for it is better that they marry than sin. Verily, it imports more an exhortation to marry than a permission. That is well confirmed thereby if a Confessary be chosen for supplementation, it can properly be strengthened through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessary beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains to ordinary election, not to extraordinary one. For if a Confessary be chosen for supplementation, it can properly be strengthened through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the

prohibition against choosing a Confessary beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received, pertains to ordinary election, not to extraordinary one. The Apostle confirms this very thing in the same place (1. Cor. 7. 5) ubi loquentes de conjugibus scribit: Nolite fraudare invicem; nisi forte ex consensu ad tempus ut vacetis orationi; et iterum revertimini in idipsum ne tentet vos Satanas propter incontinentiam vestram.

If therefore it is allowed to husband and wife to use conjugal debt for the purpose of avoiding incontinence, it will be permissible to contract matrimony presumptuously on account of the same reason. Hence Saint John Chrysostom explaining the text of the Apostle says, "One reason why God instituted Matrimony is to avoid incontinence; and his words are: What was therefore the cause of marriage?" And why it was divinely given? Paulus audivit dicentem: Ut scortationes vitandas quisque habeat uxorem suam etc., ut ex scortatione vitemus, concupiscentiam moderemus contentique uxore propria hoc nobis affert coniugium, hic ejus fructus, hoc inde lucrum est, in hoc quæ rendi nuptiae, ut ad vitam pudicè de- gendam nos adjuvent. Thus the Holy Doctor 19.

To authorities SS. The Fathers, which are opposed, respond to Author Petri Coriensis. t. 1 p. 142 v. But because if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict as it is in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, the Fathers Conjuges condemn them because they liberally appoint. Cap. II. Dub. I.

Concerning marriage in itself. They assume the force of 427 dinis following the impulse. But as for the contrary opinion, namely, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood from an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; this would be to elicit the secondary stream before the primary one. They respond: if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood from an ordinary election, not an extraordinary one; this would indeed be deordinationi to elicit the secondary stream before the primary one; if the principal end were ordered toward the secondary, but not if from two licit ends the secondary be chosen before the primary; nevertheless, such intrinsic accidental ends as procreation of offspring or avoidance of

incontinence, so that they may be honest, should be referred to God either actually, or at least virtually and habitually, as commonly they are taught. 8 D. g. n 3. Pope 1. 10 c. 8 n. 2. and with Reg. . etc. Doubt 2. Whether it is licit to contract Matrimony 883 primarily for extrinsic accidental ends, namely for the purpose of procuring pleasure, reconciling familial peace, and similar reasons? The first opinion affirms this, and the Pontifical holds thus 1:1:c.21:n.13; c.3:n.30. Sporer also considers it probable a.208.

Reasoning, because the debt due to a fitting end is always retained, it is not illicit to order nuptials for indifferent ends; for then the end (e.g., pleasure) is not principal, but merely inciting to contract Marriage, by which cohabitation is already established. But when love for procreation of offspring does not exist, and pleasure is diminished in the work of commixtion.. The second opinion denies this, and holds thus. Sporer n. 207. . 4 c. 2 § 3 n. 11. 1. 6 D. 11 n. 4 citans S. August. et S. Anselm. Reason, because it cannot be immune from any corruption, to will order a sacred thing to a profane purpose and to contract marriage for alien ends apart from those through which nuptials are licit. I think it should be distinguished: if the end in itself is honest, that is to say, peace of the people, love among kinsmen, preservation of family honor, maintenance of health, and similar things, then I think one should say with Pope 1 [c. Con]. D. 25 dub. 1 n. 14 et n. 3 (qui id habet ut certum, contra nestis præ fine primario, modo iste non excludatur.

However, if the end is not honest, that is, if it is for the sake of pleasure or of greed for riches, or vain honor, as held in 2 n. 4 with common opinion. 6. Parties to a contract, in order not to sin, ought to be in grace; this is presumptuously understood when they conclude by means of an attorney, because then they truly receive the sacrament, even though they are asleep. It is otherwise concerning the procurator by whom they contract, as well as concerning the copulating priest; because he neither receives nor administers the Sacrament, but merely assists as a witness. Card. de Lugo in Sacramentorum dubia 8 s. q. 155.* (Ià 89 cum.

But if one should command while himself being in mortal sin, he would commit the same kind of sin as if he were contracting directly; Rônc. p. 143 q. 6. And indeed he would commit a twofold sacrilege: firstly because he indignantly receives the Sacrament; secondly because he indignantly ministers, which we will say in n. 897 and following. But this last one is probably not mortal according to what was said in 32 cum Sponsi non sint Ministri ad tale Sacrum consecrati.) * 865 Notandum hic: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de

electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., ut Procurator contrahat Matrimonium nomine alterius, plura requirantur; scilicet I. Special mandate; if a Confessor be elected for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Whatsoever, if a Confessor be elected for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Nevertheless, no scriptural requirement is needed, but it suffices if an oration is delivered, as they say in 2 D. 11 num. 5 et 14 part. 9 n. 2 cum Gutt. et n. 15 et cum Gutier. II. That a mandate be held for contracting with a determined person; see c. III.

That a procurator contracts in person; for he cannot himself delegate, unless he have express and special permission from the principal. And these three are expressed in the final chapter on Procurators in G. IV. That the command may not be revoked (nor presumptuously mentally departed from) by the commander before the Marriage is celebrated; n. 98 cum Pont. Chap. II.

Dub. I. On Marriage in itself. 429 and Bonac. And this is valid even if the revocation is made tacitly, namely, if someone has given a command to contract with one person and later celebrates the betrothal with another: 10 et num. 2 cum Ut Procurator ostendat mandatum Parochio et testibus, et coram eis contrahat Matrimonium, juxta formam Tridentini. Non est autem requirendum ut coram eisdem tradatur mandatum procuratoris ex parte mandantis; n. 102 cum Pontio, Ut procurator limites mandati non excedat.

In hac tamen re advertendum est: si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium accipienda est strictius de electione ordinaria quam extraordinaria; si conditio sit requisita a mandante, scilicet ut contrahatur cum tali dote, tuli tempore, etc.; si non servetur conditio, Matrimonium sit futurum nullum; 24 dub. 9 nu. 67. If however the condition be required by law, namely, that it be contracted with the aforementioned denunciations and with the obtained license from the Bishop, etc., then the Marriage will be valid without those initiations, as commonly they say, n. 101 cum. Reg. Diana, etc. Because Matrimony without those is by itself valid, though illicit: therefore such a marriage, when celebrated through a Proxy; this form,

indeed, is appended to properly accomplishing the act, but not as a condition without which the mandate would be invalid. Here it is asked whether, if someone gave a mandate without animo contrahendi but subsequently ratified the mandate before the celebration of Marriage, then a valid Marriage is contracted?

They deny that, according to De Coeterio 2, 24 dub. 9 n. 72, that mandate given without animus contrahendi was null; and thus it could not be revalidated solely by consent, but rather a new express consent must be constituted. But they affirm . 2 D. 11 n. 13. c. 3 n. 104 com Trueil. Reason, because the procurator validly contracts thereby, if by his own words he signifies the will of the mandator not just past but present; it is therefore sufficient that a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, and well can he be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary; at the time when he contracts, there must be the will of the mandator present, so that the act may stand. This seems more probable, but I do not consider the first one to be certainly improbable. In matrimoniosis talibus parochus debet interrogare procuratorem: Vis in uxorem Luciam nomine NN? Et feminam: Vis in maritum Franciscum, mediante praesenti tuo procuratore?

Marriage indeed is contracted by epistle, when one, for example, The groom writes to the bride, saying that he will give himself to her in marriage, and from then on she receives him as husband; and the bride likewise writes back to the groom, and both thereafter read their letters before the parish priest and witnesses. But when a man writes to a woman, saying that he wishes to offer her as his wife and accept her consent from thenceforth, wheresoever she has given it, then, although the woman does not reply, provided that a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. Marriage is contracted if the fœmina opens letters in the presence of Parocho and witnesses, and gives her consent; so 2 D. 12 n. 3. and Gurt. « 7. The wife has power over the body of her husband, but not to exercise a libido opposed to generation:

Consensus de præsenti, verbis, scripto, aut nutibus expressis requisituri est. However, it is sufficient to express through another, as when parents contract for their children, while these remain silent. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be understood accordingly. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, as being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election but not extraordinary, should be understood accordingly. It has been said concerning espousals of children, which are contracted by them tacitly through their parents (see ex n. 838); in like manner it is said concerning their marriage so initiated. » See Thom.

Vide. c. R. 292. * (Vir autem fictè Matrimonium contrahens tenetur ducere, ut docent Lugo de Just D. 12 nu. 48 et Croix l. 6 part. 3 nu. 297 cum i Si fraus mulieris intercesserit, ut declaravit S. C. Vide P. Zach. apud Croix l. c. Excipitur 2. If no harm is to befall the girl, as stated in Chapter II. Doubt. I. On marriage itself. 451 they add chapter n. 5 and Croix said in note n. 258 with Palao and Krimer.) It is certain among all (excepting a few, to whom Thomas refers in 4 D. 27 q. 1 art. 2 qu. 2 ad 2 et 3.

Bellarm. de 2 D. 31. n. 5. 1 et alii passim. It is proven from c. 23 de Sponsal. where it is stated that even muti and surdi validly contract marriage; and from c. un. § Fin. de Despons. inpuh. in 6 where it is said that the consent of the parents suffices for a daughter to marry if she herself remains silent; likewise from c. Is qui fidem de Clarius, which is proven from c. Tuae fraternali- tati 25 de Spons., where the question is addressed: Whether marriage can be contracted by words alone? Innocentius III sic respondit: Matrimonium in veritate contrahitur per legitem viri et mulieris consentiam, sed necessaria sunt quantum ad Ecclesiam verba consentii expressa praesenti; nam surdi et muti possunt contrahere matrimonium per consentiam sine verbis. An vero verbata sint de precepto? Others 888 affirm this, as Aversa, Cornejo, and Rodrigo affirm it. They prove it from the words shortly above mentioned (in cited c. Tuae fraternitati): Words are necessary, qua-ント

But others deny that words are necessary for the precept: thus Pontius in lib. 2, c. 7 n. 14, . 4 art. 2 n. 1, and Diana in part. 3, tract. 4. R. 248. Because (as they say), nowhere is such a precept manifesting itself. They respond to the aforementioned text by saying that Pontificius there intended minimally to exclude other signs expressing consent, and that he

said it necessary for words concerning Herculesis, not with regard to the substance of the act, but with regard to a simpler proof of conjugal obligation. And thus the presumed Glossa understands ibidem volume five.

Words saying: Non contrahitur sine verbis; vel per aliquod aliud, si quis Confessarius pro supplemento eligatur, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. intelliguntur consentire. And therefore Pontius says in the session twenty-four of Trent, chapter one: nothing is required other than if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict to be understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary.,that is, if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious and strict to be understood in terms of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Parochus, viro et muliere interrogatis, et eorum mutuo consensu intellecto, dirat: Ego vos conjugo, etc.; alii vero probabilius dicunt, verba requiri sed tantùm sub culpa veniali; ità Sanich. l. 2. D. 3 i n. 10. R. 2 et Henr. quia alia ageretur contra consuetudinem Ecclesiae.

But sincere modesty or some other reasonable cause would truly excuse such a fault. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be suitably confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; the donation of an annulus or the translation of sponsæ in domum Sponsi do not suffice to contract matrimony unless they have this custom of the place, that they signify consent; thus commonly. D. 22 n. 1 et 3. Pon. l. 2 c. 11 n. 2 et Sufficiens verò est signum, si virb exprim enti consensum fœmina manum porrigat, ut communiter AA. citati. Et sufficiat, si manus recedens ab amine porrigenti manus retrahat? Similarly affirming, but this is more truly contradicted. c. n. 6 exc. i de Spons. duor., where it is said thus: Faith however is consent, although one does not clasp the hand, still nevertheless to consent with heart and mouth is required.

Wherefore it is not sufficient for contracting, if a Confessor be chosen as an addition, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the addition, because the prohibition concerning the choice of a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood

of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one. For even though faith is given when the hand is not withdrawn from him who extends his hand, yet in addition it is required that he express assent with the mouth; thus the Glossa understands "strings" (stringit). Questio est: An sufficiat consensus conditionatus? » Resp. i. The conditional consent suffices, under the condition concerning the past or present state, provided that: then the contract is not suspended * (And this holds true presumptively, if the condition were dishonorable, namely: "I desire you, if you have fornicated; if you hate my enemy. Then indeed, without the fulfilled condition, a marriage is' nullum, because there is altogether a lack of consent.

It is sufficient under the necessary condition of futurity, provided that those contracting do not intend to suspend such consent; for example, "I take you," if tomorrow. Dub. I. On Marriage itself. 435 "sol oratur." Item, in a condition imposed by way of future possibility, e.g.,

If you have been defiled by a calumny; or if it is a future turpitude, provided that it does not repugn to the substance of matrimony and the consent be absolute, for instance, if your father has been killed. The reason is, because such conditions are considered as if they were not added. 5. dub. 15. Mol. The fill. ... 2 c. » 18. dub. 15. » » Resp. 3. Not sufficient under the condition of a future time, that it be contrary to the substance of the obligation of matrimony, for example, if you wish to impede the generation of offspring through malice, or to obtain a slave by adultery.

It is manifest from the conclusion of the distinction on concupiscence. V. . 5. d. 10. Conclusion of the 29th chapter. Doubt 3. If indeed the condition concerning the future is necessary, namely that your spouse will die; if tomorrow the sun will set, etc., the Marriage does not thereby become void, as commonly say St. Thomas in IV.

D. 29. qu. 2 ar. 3 q. 3. q. 4. R. 1. and moreover 10. with others. It is said of itself, for if the contracting party says thus intending to will and expect a time of such condition, then the Marriage is suspended until that event occurs; cf. loc. cit. et et n. 30. Si vero conditio esset turpis, tunc distinguendum: si illa sit contra substantiam matrimonii, nampe contra bonum sacramenti, fidei vel proli, tunc utique nullum reddit matrimonium. But if the condition were turpitudinously otherwise (or impossible); for these, although they do not render null any other contracts, at least before their fulfillment, as they say in 4. ar. 6. n. 5. ex de Iau. stip., yet in marriage are considered as non-adjoined; so is it expressed in the final canon of Condit. appos.: If conditions contrary to the substance of matrimony be introduced, for instance if the one party marries another only to avoid generation of offspring: until such time as I

find a more honorable or more wealthy partner; or if you are delivered to another for the purpose of adultery; however favorable the matrimonial contract may be, it lacks effect.

Even though other conditions may be properly inserted in Matrimony, if they are turpitudo or impossibility, they should nevertheless be considered as non-adjoined on account of its favor: to be held thus. The reason is; because when the condition is turpid or impossible, then: the Church presumes that an absolute consent of the contracting parties is present. Wherefore the Blessed Pope attentively considers in the first book, third chapter, number nine, page four. Nevertheless, in doubt it is to be presumed that those are intended as a joke and not with the mind of suspending the consent, as they say, 5 D. 3 n. 15. Pope decree number nine.

Holzrn. et . c. ex c. 16. de Question Noneautem hic quid dicendum cum matrimonium celebratur sub conditione si pater meus consenserit? Resp. si condition est de praesenti, vel praeterito, stante consensu Patris, iam valet Matrimonium, etiamsi contrahentes illud ignorant. When however the condition is future in nature, then the marriage is altogether suspended. Marriage is suspended until the occurrence of the condition; this is certain for all, see 5 D 7 n. 3 and Pont. 1. 3 c. 13 n. 23. But Dubit. 1.

What is to be said if the Father remains silent? It would be responded that then circumstances must be considered; for if such a conjecture exists, and a Confessor is chosen as supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen as supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Father may remain silent because he dissents, as if Father remains silent, lest he displease the Lord or a Friend; then his silence is to be held for dissent. Otherwise, if the conjecture be such that, should any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it might well be confirmed through another triennium following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, is to be understood; for should any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it might well be confirmed through another triennium following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict

regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, is to be understood. Therefore, let him remain silent because he pleases; so Sanch 1. c. n. 11 et In dubio, however, concerning consent or dissent of the Father, stands on the intention of those contracting, whether they were contented themselves, or whether, Father positively does not contradict, as it is said: But what if a doubt arises concerning this intention of those who are confused? Angel.,: among those who think so, because it should be fulfilled according to a specific form; from 1.

Who to the heir. § 1 and 1. Mævius. ff. de commissione et demonstratione. At Chapter II. Doubt. I.

On Marriage itself. More commonly and probably presumptuously, Bon. l.c., 4 art., 6 n. 7 adduce, cum commune, ut asserit, Sauch. l. 5 D. 7 n. 12, cum n. 59, cum etc. hoc tace- mentium habendum est pro consensu, quia talis conditio, si pater consentiet, juxta communem sensum intelligitur, si positivum non dissentiet. That shall have all the more reason, if the Father dies before dissenting, as rightly he says in the contrary case against Pope Leo IV, chapter 17, note 15. Indeed he well observes . c. Reg. in prax. 2. if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be satisfactorily confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is to be rigidly and odiously construed regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary one. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be satisfactorily confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is to be rigidly and odiously construed regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary one. Parochi sine urgentissima causa numquam admittere debeant haec Matrimonia conditionalia, propert plura inconvenientia et difficultates, quae deinde occurre possunt contra ipsorum validitatem. Dubium. 2.

What, if? Father, having been informed more certainly at first felt, and subsequently assented, whether then the condition has been fulfilled? They deny. Digest, Book 7, Note 9. Pope [or Patriarch] in the fourth book, chapter seventeen, number fifteen, chapter seven, number fifty-seven, with Soto and Con. The condition of affinity toward the father is lacking with regard to Matrimony; hence, those who have contracted it can withdraw from it even if the Father later consents: for a bond once extinguished does not revive again.

Contrary to this opinion, according to this reasoning, per se speaking, it is not approved by me; but the second opinion appears very probable if the Father consents after a brief interval, so that the Matrimony is said to be

more suitably called invalid when the Father subsequently dissents shortly afterwards: as . c. and Et to this opinion adheres Croix l. 6 p. 3 n. 86, rightly saying, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict as it should be applied to ordinary election, not to extraordinary one. VI. Tract. Sixth. On Marriage. The bishop dissented, so that there may be no hope that consent will be given within a brief time. 94 ' Doubt. 3.

What if in the time conditionally set for consent, the Father had already ceased to be alive? Response would be: If the contracting parties already knew about the death of the Father at that time, then that condition is considered as unadded and impossible; thus commonly and according to 5 D. 7 n. 19, when . Loophole, whether it would validate Marriage? They deny, Prep. and others at . But it is more probable according to c. cum Con. et . 59, as Henry affirms; because that condition is understood as appended so that marriage might not be contracted contrary to the will of the Father; and this reason having ceased with the death of the Father.

Et tamen valeat matrimonialis contractus aut sponsali inter impeditos alicuius dirimendi impedimento sub conditione: si pater sit dispensavit? See regarding this the aforementioned [work] 1.3 n. 65o, and this 1.6 n. 85g. Resp. 4. Consensus sub conditione honesta de futuro est contractus sponsalium tantum et non Matrimonii, quia hic debet esse de praesenti. By what reason the Marriage will not commence to be valid without a new consent, after the condition has been fulfilled, as is taught by St. Thomas and others in that place.

If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be suitably confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium should be regarded as odious and strict in matters of ordinary election, but not in extraordinary ones. A contract concluded under an honest condition of future validity, once this condition is fulfilled, will be purified. If a confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three-year period after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; this concession holds if those contracting remain in the same consent at least virtually. Doubt: Is a new consensus required in Marriage when the condition has been fulfilled? The first sentence affirms what are held [to be true]. 1. 7 c. 12 n. 18. With reference to Pontifical authority, volume 1, chapter 3, number 14, note 5, along with Soto and

Val. Covetousness and fraudulence, cap. VII, n. 66, who with Cap. II.

Dub. From the treatise On Marriage, Chapter 46, paragraph favor: Alternatively (the condition), is contingent, like a gift of money or acceptance by the parents; and thus the judgment about such consent is as if it were formed through words referring to the future, whence it does not constitute Marriage. The reason is one, namely, because since Matrimony is not merely a contract but a presumed Sacrament, it cannot depend on a future condition; for all things. Sacramenta statim aut validaque aut nullius esse debent. Ratio 2. quia, licet in aliis contractibus possit transferri dominium ad tempus; in Matrimonio tamen dominium corporum debet tradiri in perpetuum; etideo oportet, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria, impleta conditione, novus apponatur consensus.

The second opinion denies this, and this is held by p. 10 n. 20 c. 22 n. 63 1. 5 D. 8 n. 5 with Palud. P. Soto, et Henr. ac Avers: Gabr. omnes autem con- tractus, impleta conditione, sine novo consensu per- ficiuatur ex l. This sale. Seven feet concerning what is to be contracted. And thus is the response given according to the first reason. If a response is made regarding 2, that if someone be chosen as Confessor for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, must be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Dominion shall not be handed over pending condition; but only when the condition is verified; for then, since the consensus virtually preceding persists, Matrimony from conditional becomes absolute.

Nor truly does Doctor Thomas contradict this opinion, for in the cited place the Sacred Doctor speaks solely apart from the realization of the condition, and thus properly says: if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, during the condition being pending, one cannot truly say that Matrimony becomes absolute, but rather if a Confessor is elected for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Thus

the internal agreement would be equated with sponsals, so that nuptials by law with another are not allowed. Both opinions are probable, but the second seems more probable. Otherwise rightly do they say, pp. 3 n. 762. consultius esse eo casu iterum contrahi Matrimonium. What if there is an impediment to contracting marriage between the parties, and they have consented conditionally; will the impediment cease? They concur equally: 1. 5 D. 8; n. 10. and Croix 1. 6 p. 3 n. 85. with Augustine. Cor. et Crimo, nec novi consensus requirendi, si impedimentum cessat.

However, Victoria according to that same place. Croix holds that a new consent is required; this seems to me more probable, since the consent given during the impediment does not appear sufficiently valid; and thus P. Zacharia according to Croix I. c. declares in similar cases before the Sacred Congregation. Here it should be noted, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict according to ordinary election, not extraordinary, differs in condition, reason, manner, day; for demonstration or added cause (for example, if one says: I take you, O virgin, or because you are a virgin) does not vitiate nor suspend Matrimony (let the cause be false, or foul, presumptuous against the substance of Marriage, as in 5 D. 19 n. 2.). For although he would not contract, if he knew her not to be a virgin, yet then he gives an absolute consent which is not hindered unless by error regarding the substance, or regarding substantial conditions of Matrimony; but see n. 1012. Neither suspends the mode, if it is said in the words of grammar: "I lead you, that you may serve the militia." Ita et 4 a. 6 n: 2.

Even if the mode is of a dishonorable thing, or an impossible one: I lead you to kill, etc. The reason is that consent does not depend on the mode, but agreement depends on the condition. And even if (as [said] 7 with Sanoh, because it does not seem to have a soul capable of contracting, who has an intention opposed to the contract. Whether an added day suspends the contract, for example, if it is said: I will lead you after three days? Denies . n. 11. But they more probingly affirm . [from] Disertatio De Ministro, and Forma Sacramenti Matrimonii.

They deny that the Minister of Matrimony is an assistant Priest and use the very words of the form: 'I myself join this man to this woman in marriage,' etc. Thus Canonicus de Loca, Theologia I, 8. Chap. H. Doubt and On Marriage according to itself. 45g and 8 Jusini Institutes. Theol. de n. 5: Hoc autem probabile est secundum Estium l. 4 D. 26 § 10 et Habert de Matrimonio c. 4 citans pro hac sententia: Tolet. l. 7 de Nam (ut rectè ajunt Bellarm. de Sacramento III), qui in Sacramento materiam Formam

applicat, ille utique est Sacramenti Minister. The moments, however, pertaining to this first proposition will be considered below in the objections, against which we shall respond.

The second common thesis, which seems reliably certain, is that these very persons are the Ministers of this Sacrament, and that the form consists in the words by which they express their consent; so Bellarmine, who calls our thesis common in his Schools (as he himself admits presumptuously), and contrary to the new and false thesis of Gonet in De Fratribus, id. t. q. 3 a. 1. Cabras. T. I. l. 3 c. 18 n. 1. with the common opinion of all Theologians, 2. A belly p. 200 qu. 1 and 2: Wigandt. tr. 16 n. 10. Burbos. . q. 64 d. 10.

Section 1. Bon: p. 4 n. 5: with Con. Rule. Pontius' l. 1 c. 8 n. 3. with Vasquez and : P. Benedictus. XIV. concerning the Council from Tome two page 266 with Gotto, Cardinal.

Bellarmine 10.7 and 8, ubi vocat falsam sententiam: Cani et nostram communem de Clandestinorum desp. n. 51, ubi ait opinionem contrariam esse periculosa in fide; . 2 D: 16 cum Lop. Vega, Henr. et Manuel, qui appellant oppositam temerariam Merbes; de Matr. qu. 6, qui testatur, omnes Theologos asserere opinionem Cani numquam fuisse probabilem, refertque Vasq. et Led! asserere, nam non posse defendi sive nota, et Soluth ac: vocare temerariati. They hold our science, and expressly D: Th: qn: 4 D. 26 qu. 2 art. 1 ad 1 et Dist. 16: qui art. 3 (we copy the very words in response to 1). Object.) And the schoolman in D. 26, qu. 4, n. 14, c. 24, i declared that formerly all clandestine marriages and those celebrated without the assistance of a parish priest were true and valid; and he anathematized him who denied this. However, marriages of the faithful cannot be held valid and ratified, unless they are sacraments, as shall be proven shortly below.

If therefore clandestine marriages were once held valid and thus constituted Sacraments, it should be said that if a Confessor is chosen as supplement, they can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election does not apply to extraordinary election. For the Parochus is not Minister but the parties themselves who contract; if a Confessor is chosen as supplement, they can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election does not apply to extraordinary election. Moreover marriages are thus held valid because they are Sacraments, which is demonstrated in D.

Augustine's work "On the Good of Marriage" cap. 24 there: The good of marriage throughout all nations is for the sake of procreation; if a Confessor is chosen as supplement, they can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election does not apply to extraordinary election. For the good of the people of God pertains, presumptuously in the sanctity of the Sacrament. Article 8. But in our marriages, the sanctity of the Sacrament is worth more when virginity of the womb is present. But it is not true that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, implies all Sacraments should be ministered by others rather than by Priests, since laity may also sometimes be legitimate Ministers of the Sacrament of Baptism; for Christ constituted Ministers of the Sacraments according to the nature of each one; and because the nature of a contract is that it be established through the mere consent of those contracting, hence in Matrimony, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, consists in a contract elevated to a Sacrament; Christ did not constitute other Ministers than those contracting by their own consent as the form of administering the Sacrament. Objection 4 says: If a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, is so. Sacramentum (scilicet Matrimonii) si quis congruenter decet accipere, accedente Sacerdotali precatione, confert donum Spiritus sancti quo vir diligit uxorem; congruenter Christus dilexit Ecclesiam.

From which it follows, if a Confessary be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessary beyond the triennium is odious and strict in accordance with the election of an ordinary, not extraordinary minister. For, if by the blessing of the Priest the gift of the Spirit be conferred; therefore, through that is the Sacrament perfected. But rightly respond Frassen, and Bellarm. II. cc., si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de

electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. ex verbis istius Concilii potius ducatur oppositum; nam illa ex suo sensu significat, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. per precationem Sacerdotalem conficitur Sacramentum, sed potius si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., Sacramento jam confecto; precatio illa accedat, quà donum conferatur Spiritus Sancti, preces Sacerdotis exaudiendi. The more so, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can conveniently be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received concerning an ordinary election, not extraordinary, that which, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, can conveniently be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received concerning an ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Enchiridion, thereafter published by the same Council, explicitly states: "The words of the covenant, by which they mutually give faith to each other, are the word (that is, the form) whereby the Sacrament is made." Objection III.

You have repeated the same paragraph twice. Please provide the unique target sentence for translation. The Church in external forum will not judge those legitimate conjugia which are not approved by the testimony of the priest, presuming then that mutual consent was lacking; unless (as is subjoined in the same text) their own will has sufficed as a confirmation; therefore, where the will of the contracting parties is present, valid Marriage is initiated, although in external forum something else may be presumed. If a confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be

confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in ordinary election, not in extraordinary. For if a confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in ordinary election, not in extraordinary. But certainly at that place Evaristus speaketh of the external forum, wisely saying whence, lest it be said that the Tridentine testimony contradicteth the testimony of Evaristus; for if a confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in ordinary election, not in extraordinary. Evaristus dicit, necessario de foro externo intelligendum. Another objects that Canus raises objections which can easily be answered, as you can see in our previous decision; namely, if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be confirmed through another three-year period following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously interpreted concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Marriage, quae per Procuratorem celebrantur, quia sunt legitimi contractus, vera praesumptum congruent Sacramenta, nec opus est ut contraheutes postea coram Parocho se sistant ad Matrimonium ratificandum; . 2 D. 11 n. 27 et Bellar c. 7 n. 8 cum . It is inserted 2 that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can indeed be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in ordinatio, but not extraordinaria. That, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can indeed be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in ordinatio, but not extraordinaria. Marriage maliciously contracted before the Parochial priest with reluctance, and denying him benediction, albeit grievously illicit, are nevertheless valid and true Sacraments, as all who cite our judgment maintain; and this even if the Parochius affects not to understand, namely by closing his eyes and ears, as Pontius 1.5 c.29 n.22 et alii assert from Sacred Decree where it is asked: And what if the Parochus had been present? yet nothing of what was done did he see, Cap. II. Dub. I. On Marriage itself. 447 or heard, whether such a marriage is null?

Sac. Conc. The Council replied: Marriage would not be valid, were it not:

he would have understood it; unless the Parish Priest himself had not desired to understand it. It is inferred 3: if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary; hence, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Marriage celebrated once in the presence of the parish priest and witnesses with a dissolving impediment kept secret, after the impediment is removed through dispensation, truly evades the Sacraments by consent given by the priest's absence; see the aforementioned n. 1110.

And this argument; as Benedict XIV. says in the quoted place, very much proves that the Minister of Matrimony is not a Priest, but the Spouses themselves; otherwise correctly stated, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Church would never permit Spouses to remain in danger, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he could be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; which, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, could remain in his grace of the Sacrament. However, there is the Decree of the Sacred Congregation on the 8th day of June in the year 1619 regarding Marriage, No. 19: if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict to be accepted in ordinary election, not in extraordinary, is such that, if the Marriage were null by reason of public cause, namely on account of defect of age, then it must be revalidated before the Parochial priest and witnesses. It is stated 4: if a Confessor be elected for supplementation, it can properly be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not supplementary. Parochus; si assistat Matrimonio existens in mortali; non peccet graviter, quia non conficit, nec ministrat Sacramentum; ita 2 D. 6 n. 2 et 5 cum Gutt. et cit. sess. 24 c. 1.

Denies he who cites but affirms 32. 180 cum Reb. Henry and Salsedo; and this more pleases me. But then a question arises: whether from the spouses, who are entering into Matrimony, it may validly be separated the reason of the contract from the reason of the Sacrament? They deny: according to St. Paul regarding marriage. D. 5 sect. 1 Pont l. 7 c. 9 n. 3 et alii, dicentes, non posse hominem separare, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. God joined together.

But they affirm Vasq. Cajet Durand. Victory, and others among. But Lib. 844. Sixth.

Treatise. Sixth. On Marriage. This should be noted: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood to apply to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For this action would lack grave fault if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, and can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood to apply to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Whereupon it is inferred, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementary confession, he can properly be confirmed through another three years following the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplementary confession, he can properly be confirmed through another three years following the period of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The Church would never permit the revalidation of Matrimony without the assistance of the Parochi (as the Church itself admits everywhere), tolerating, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, that it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. That, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the

prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary.

Matrimony would persist as a contract, and not as a Sacrament, if it were not certain that, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The spouses be true Ministers of the Sacrament. DUBIUM II. DE USU MATRIMONII. ARTICULUS I. An usus Matrimonii, sive actus conjugalis sit licitus? 900 Actus conjugalis illicitus est. I.

If the marriage is null. II. If Marriage is doubtful. 901 Qu. I. Whether it is licit to contract matrimony with a person concerning whom there is doubt regarding an impediment P 902 Qu.

II. Whether it is licit to contract with a probable opinion regarding the non-existence of an impediment? Qu. III. Whether with a probable opinion the act was done from probablety? 903 Qu.

II. In a doubt regarding the value of a marriage already contracted, is it licit to ask for and give back [the marriage]? And notably; whether a wife uncertain about the death of her first husband is bound to return to a second husband? 904 Dub. 1. An dubio subvenienti post diligentiam bonae fidei contracto matrimonio liceat petere? Si adsit solum probabile opinio pro nullitate matrimonii, quid? May one, having entered into marriage with doubtful faith, after due diligence, doubt and petition thereafter?

Dub. 4. In a doubt of affirmation should judgment be made in favor of the contracted Marriage? Or is a wife bound to believe him who asserts that she falsely assented? What if he hears an impediment and about it there are witnesses not worthy of credit? What if he hears from one person worthy of credit? 909 III. The coupling is illicit if it takes place with peril to health.

D. 1. Is it licit to petition if one of the spouses is laboring under a stone, by a French disease, or similarly? Is it licit to petition after bathing, or after phlebotomy, or when there is fever? Or immediately after meals? Dub. 2. Is it permissible to ask during the time of lactation? §2 IF. If it is done for the sake of pleasure. Chap. II.

Dub. II. On Marriage itself. 449. §13 V. If a adulterous mind be made.

What if the spouse is aroused unto himself for pleasure from the beauty of another person? Section 14: What if he takes pleasure in extramarital intercourse? Section 15: If it happens in an undue manner. Section 16 Question I.

Whether there is mortal sin in desiring illicit copulation in a preposterous vessel? §17 Q. II. Is it fitting to copulate in an unnatural situation? §18 Q. III. Is it a mortal sin to refrain from emission after the act of copulation has commenced? §19 But moreover, can the wife, upon the husband withdrawing himself after emission, immediately through touch arouse herself to further emission? §20 VII. If it occurs in an inappropriate place. (Referred to at the law 3, note 458.) §21 VIII. If it occurs at an improper time. §22 Q. I.

Is it permissible for the spouse to cohabit on the day of Communion? (Remitted to numbers 273 and 274 in this book.) VI.) §23 Q. II. On the feast days? §24 Q. III. At the time of pregnancy? Whether, however, coitus with pregnancy is a venial sin when abortion ensues from that danger? §25 Q. IV.

Is it permitted to cohabit during menstruation? §26 Q. Is it permitted to cohabit during the time of purgation after childbirth? §27 However, the use of Marriage is licit, I. On account of the offspring. II To avoid incontinence. (See d. n. 892 D. 1.) III. On account of other virtuous ends.) See d. n. 883. D. 3.) §28 Qu.

I. Is it advisable for someone to be bound to seek [something]? §29 Q. II. Is a wife ever to be taken in question? §30 Q. III. Whether a wife ever may ask for separation on account of a vow, or because of a contracted affinity? §31. Q. IV.

Is it permissible to petition for one who is excommunicated due to a vow, or affinity contracted? And by whom can it be done? §32 When and under what circumstances is it permitted for there to be contact, sight, and detestable speech between spouses? §33. Q. I. Are turpia tactus et aspectus between themselves mortal sins when one is secluded from the danger of pollution? §34 Q. II. What if pollution danger is already anticipated? §35 Some particularly abominable touches are carefully considered. §36 Q. III. Would it be a grave sin for a husband to touch himself impudently in another's absence? §37 Q. IV. Whether, if he grossly takes delight morosely in the copulation past or to be had? «Resp.

It is licit and honorable in itself. If a confessor is chosen for the

supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, is of faith, and this is apparent from 1. Corinth. 2. Wife to her husband debt let be rendered. By accident is it illicit in subsequent cases. . ## Lib VI.

Treatise. Sixth [part] On Marriage. I. If Matrimony apart from things [is null], if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood for ordinary election and not extraordinary.

» tamen, si uterque ignorat, non peccat, nisi mate- rialiter. If both are certain about it, or if one certainly knows it, they cannot use marriage with any presumptuous risk proposed to them. Wherefore if he cannot without risk to life or reputation disclose the impediment, nor hope for dispensation, he should either enter religion (if he has not yet consummated it); or figure, or petition divortium (on account of his wife's cruelty, or adultery, if such there be), or certainly endure all inconveniences patiently. II. If the marriage be doubtful.

And indeed, if only one party doubts, he cannot remit the debt; yet he is nonetheless bound to render it, when the other has a right to demand it. If both have contracted a marriage based on doubtful faith, or if either doubts concerning its value, neither may petition nor demand, before the investigation of the truth. Vasq. . d. 6 tr. 11 p. 7 § 3. According to what follows after that above卷积 It is unpleasant to me to discourse at length on this matter which so abundantly exhibits foulness, even casting pure consciences themselves into confusion merely by its name; but that such a matter should be frequently encountered in confessions does not mean that the confessor must necessarily be fully instructed, but only sufficiently so!

Let the chaste reader forgive me if on this subject I shall speak, and if in particular cases I descend to that which exhibits a more deformed turpitude. If any confessor shall be chosen as a supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period is so odious and strict, being understood differently from ordinary

election to extraordinary election. If anyone finds this remarkable, let him listen to the most illustrious man Louis Bail, who (in volume 2, an excellent work defending Marriage), says these words: "It is true that some matters concerning foul acts touch on detestable things, but if speech is foul, it is fouler still in sin to corrupt what is foul." Thus says Peter Blesensis. That Author moves to some defilements, but regarding the cure of those who reproach. If angels were men, you would have had no need to suffer. Chapter II.

dub. II. On Marriage itself. Question. I.

May a marriage be contracted with doubt regarding an abolishing impediment? Before diligence is applied to attain the truth, it is certain that after diligence duly exercised, commonly taught are the doctors that marriage can be contracted with a probable opinion of the law regarding the lack of an impediment, provided that such opinion has been uniformly or certainly received as probable. Thus. I. An liceat matrimonium contrahere cum dubio de impedimento dirimente? I D. 6 a. 18. . 88 D. 3 p. 4 § 9 n. 4. Innoc.

Eleven. Page three. Treatise three. Question sixty-seven. Article eight. D. ult. Cross I. 6 p. 1 n. 117 and p. 3 nu. 527 and 538 and tit. 1 § 51 ex n. 1928 and t. 2 p. 369 n. 491 with the common: and that sentence called by Cardo. 1. c. . n. 29 et Cross d. n. 117. with others. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it may be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict and should be understood with regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, which with a probable opinion does not allow the Sponsals of the Sacrament of Matrimony to be administered by the Spouses. For it is replied that if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, is given; whereby, if there exists a probable opinion, the Sacrament is not administered in that case with merely probable opinion, but with moral certainty; for when by law an opinion is probable, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, is given; whereby if there does not remain an impediment, then the Church, according to its ancient custom, is presumed to approve the contract of Matrimony and remove every impediment, as

the aforementioned authors commonly declare with others, and Fuscus approves in Cardenas 1. c. a. n. 542 in several Decisions of the Roman Congregation, and certain Declarations of Urban VIII.

However, to be noted is this: if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can be confirmed for another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strictly to be received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, with a probable opinion, does not suffice for the administration of the Sacrament of Matrimony; when indeed there is a probable opinion according to law, if a Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can be confirmed for another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strictly to be received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, with a probable opinion does not suffice; then the Church is presumed from very ancient custom to approve the contract of Matrimony if no impediment subsists, and all remove the impediment, as commonly the aforementioned AA. declare with others, and certain Decisions of the Roman Rota and Declarations of Urban VIII approve, quod si dubium vertat circa mortem prioris conjugis, tunc sive sit negativum sive positivum non liceat Matrimonium contrahere, quidquid dicat 1 n. 41 et Vidal ad Wig. tr. i6. Case after n. 52) since he possesses a prior marriage, he cannot contract a subsequent one with prejudice to the prior one unless it is certain (at least morally) of the death of the prior spouse, as expressed in c. Dominus: "If a confessor be elected for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not electing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strictly accepted, is regarded from ordinariate election, not extra-ordinariate." That is to say, if it is certain (at least morally) of an impediment, and it is not certain of his own dispensation, your power does not possess. ## Lib VI. Treatise. VI. Of Marriage.

I. If Matrimony apart from anything else is nothing: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted strictly for ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted strictly for ordinary election, not extraordinary. » nevertheless, if both are ignorant, they do not sin, except materially. If both are certain about it, or one is certain

about it, they cannot use marriage with which any presumptuous danger has been proposed, whatever it may be. Whereby if it is not possible for him without danger to life or reputation to disclose the impediment, nor to hope for a dispensation, he ought either to enter religion (if he has not yet taken firm vows); or to figure, or to petition the court (owing to his wife's cruelty, or for adultery, if such be the case); or certainly to patiently endure all inconveniences.

II. If the marriage is in doubt. And indeed, if only one party doubts, he cannot claim a debt; yet he is bound to make repayment, when the other has a right to demand it. If both parties have entered into a doubtful faith-based contract, or doubt concerning its value, neither may petition nor repay before the investigation of the truth. Vasq. . d. 6 tr. 11 p. 7 sect. 3.

As regards after that in the aforementioned [work], book 1, treatise 1, chapter 2, section 3. It grieves me to speak at length about this matter which so abundantly displays depravity, even casting blame upon innocent meats merely by name; yet since such a matter is so frequently encountered in the confessions as not to require the confessor necessarily to weep but rather to suffice with a concise instruction! Let the chaste reader forgive me, if here I speak ill of this matter, which so abundantly abounds in corruption, and if in order to descend to particular cases, which exhibit a more deformed turpitude, I do so! If any confessarius is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessarius beyond a triennium is so odious and strict in regard to ordinary election that it should not apply to extraordinary election. If anyone finds this strange, our authors have in other places warned and instructed prudently and piously on this matter, having more extensively treated of it and described the circumstances of various cases; let him listen to the most illustrious Ludavicus Baill, who (in book 2, an excellent work defending Marriage) says: "Though some things concerning acts of adultery may be touched upon in the matter, it is more foul than hell; and if speech is foul, it becomes fouler in sin, as Peter Blesensis says." That Author moves to some obscenities, but with regard to the care of penitents.

If angels were men, they would not need partitions. Chapter II. Dub. Second. On Marriage in itself.

Who: I. May a marriage be contracted with doubt concerning an impairing impediment? Before diligent recourse is had to attain the truth, it is certain that after the diligent recourse actually made, it would not have been licit to contract marriage with an opinion probable in accordance

with the law about the lack of an impediment, provided that such opinion is either universally or certainly received by AA as probable; so it is taught by the DD. I. Antequam diligenti adhibeatur ad veritatem assequendum, certum est non liceret post verè diligentiam adhibitum, como muniter docent DD. posse contrahi Matrimonium cum opinione probabili probabilitate juris de carentia impedimenti, modo opinio illa sit universè vel certe ab AA. recepta ut probabilis; ita. I D. 6 a. 18. . 88 D. 3 p. 4 § 9 n. 4.

Innoc. XI. Page 3, Title 3, Question 67, Article 8. Section 6, page 1, note 117 and page 3, number 527 and 536, and title 1, section 51, from note 1928; also volume 2, page 369, note 491 with the common; and they call this sentence tutam and morally certain by Cardia. Chapter 1, note 29 and Cross decision number 117 with others. It does not hinder to say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary one. For according to a probable opinion, it is not permissible for the Spouses to administer the Sacrament of Matrimony. Nam respondeatur, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Eo casu non ministratur Sacramentum cum sola opinione probabili, sed cum moraliter certitudine; quando enim adest opinio probabili de jure, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Non subsistens impedimentum, tunc Ecclesia ex antiquissima consuetudine praesumitur contractum Matrimonii approbare, et omne removere impedimentum, ut communiter dicitur praefati AA. cum aliis, et fube probant Eardenas 1. c. a. n. 542 pluribus Decisionibus Rute Romanæ, ac quaedam Declarationes Urbani VIII. However, it must be noted that if a Confessor is chosen for a supplement, he may be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement,

since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in ordinary election but not extraordinary, does not apply; when there is doubt regarding the death of the prior spouse, then whether it be negative or positive, marriage may not be contracted, whatever may be said to the contrary.

Case after n. 52) quia, cum possideat prius conjugium, non potest secundum iniri cum praejudicio prioris, nisi constet (saltem moraliter) de morte prioris conjugis, ut expressum habetur in c. Dominus, de Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., si constet de impedimento, et non constet de ipsius dispensatione, tunc non possit Matrimonium contrahi, neque post contractum peti debitum; tunc enim pariter praevalet impedimentum. Accordingly, if it is determined that a dispensation exists and there is doubt concerning its validity, because then the possession is considered in accordance with the value of the dispensation. This nevertheless holds true, if the impediment be canonical law. But Quaeritur. II.

An impediente probabile stante, conforme al diritto naturale, possa contrarre Matrimonio con opinione parimenti probabile sull'insussistenza dell'impedi menti? I respond: strictly speaking it is not allowed, because it is illicit to administer the Sacrament of Matrimony with merely probable opinion concerning its value, as is evident from proposition 1 condemned by Innocent. VI. Quando contra adsit praesumpta probabilitas impedimenti praesunta de jure naturali; nempe si dubium vertat de solutione prioris Matrimonii; tunc enim Ecclesia nequit dispensare, ut potest et praesumitur jam dispensare, cum adest dubium positivum (ut diximus) de impedimento juris tantum Ecclesiastici. I said per se speaking; for a very urgent and grave cause a marriage can be contracted provided that there is a declaration from the Supreme Pontiff as the unique interpreter of divine law. And thus Cardinal Cerdan referred to Urban VIII as having declared in Proposition 1 of old.

For it was reported to him a doubt by Joan- nem de Lugo, subsequently by the Cardinal, whether marriages of some infidel Indians contracted in the Kingdom of Paraquarie in the state of infidelity were valid? And whether those very ones after Baptism were bound to receive their first wives from among those they had previously possessed, or whether they could choose

whichever displeased them least? The Pontiff in said Decree stated that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, to the extent that it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; whereupon, if doctors' opinions were equally probable in both respects, conclusions would follow concerning conditions, places: and peoples more favorable to barbarous human beings. Inquire. III. Whether it is licit to contract marriage with a probable opinion not only of law, that is, from doctrinal and authoritative source, but also of fact, namely when there exists on both parts probability regarding the presence and absence of impediment?

They affirm Tambur. Dec. This translates directly to "Dec." in English, which typically means "Decision" or could be a contraction for another word depending on the context not provided here. Given the limited context, it is most likely interpreted as "Decision". Cap. II.

Dub. Two. On Marriage itself. 452. 1. 1 c. 3 § 3 n. 27 and Bonac. et alii according to Croix lib. 6 p. 1 num. 118. But rightly they deny Carandas in Proposition 1. Innoc.

XI. c. with Gormaz, and Aversa. Reason, because although the Church is presumed to supply or dispense in impediments when there exists a probability arising from law, as we have said above shortly, nevertheless this: it does not proceed, when there exists a probability arising solely from fact, which does not found anything other than semi-complete proof, as Quo supposito explains. Hence, one cannot use the first opinion in contracting marriage, since although the first impression was probable, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For when alone probability of fact suffices for presumption of lack of impediment, the Church is presumed to dispense; yet since this opinion has not been commonly or certainly received as probable (which it should be in order to presume that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For when alone probability of fact suffices for presumption of lack of impediment, the Church is presumed to dispense; yet since this opinion has not been commonly or certainly received as probable (which it should be in order to

presume that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation. The Church may supply this, as rightly said in 6 p. 1 n. 117 with Aversa and Gormaz), and when it concerns the value of the Sacrament; we cannot safely follow that opinion. They say, however, D. r. 6, n. 18. prop. r, n. 31 et 1 c. 3 v. Marriage, n. 1 cum.

Merolla; idque probabilitatis putat Croix 1. 6 p. 3 n. 533 cum Spor Gob. But against this opinion it is said: 1 D. 3, p. 8, n. 10. Mother. Case 10, and 1 tractatus 1 caput 5 n. 23. with Hurtado and Veracris rightly approving the rationale adduced by the adversaries; for in other contracts, despite the negative doubt regarding the dishonor of the contract, it is licit to proceed if the doubt cannot be overcome, because then it stands for freedom; yet marriage cannot be contracted otherwise, since it does not merely have the reason of a contract but also the presumed Sacrament; and outside cases of necessity, it is not permissible to use doubtful matter in other Sacraments, so that the Sacrament is not exposed to the risk of frustration—just as Proposition 1 condemned by Iaomae. XI. Cum Hurt. et Veracr. meritoque ad approbant rationem ab adversariis adductam; quatu- vis enim in aliis contractibus, non obstante dubio negativo de inhonestate contractis, licitum sit illum inire, si dubium vinci non possit, quia tunc standum est pro libertate; Matrimonium tamen, quia non solum habet rationem contractis; sed praesumptum Sacra- menti, non potest contrahi cum materia dubia; congruent et in aliis Sacramentis non licet uti materiâ dubia extra casam necessitatis, ne Sacramentum exponatur periculo frustrationis, quxtâ Prop. i. damnatam ab Iamoe.

Consequentiam igitur primi judicii tantum posse probabilem dicere poterat, si esset probabilis opinio illorum, qui in 1. i ntm. a3. dixerunt, praefatam Propositionem esse prosperitatem non ratione periculi frustrationis Sacramenti sed ratione charitatis erga suscipientis, ne privetur fructu Sacramenti, si forte opinio de ejus valore non sit vera. And in that case Crex d. n. 533 with others noted that a part should be held doubtful for the purpose of advising an alternative regarding such a doubt, so that this may not be exposed to serious danger: inconvenience. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be received regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary, if someone were chosen as a confessor for supplementary purposes, he could be properly confirmed by another triennium following the time of the supplement, since the prohibition concerning not choosing a confessor outside of three years, as being odious and strict in regard to ordinary elections but not extraordinary ones. If, however, in such a doubt the

presumption should urgently press on account of impediment, and there be no presumption on account of his lack thereof, for example if a man were to die, and later became uncertain whether he had died within or without the prescribed limits, then the presumption arising from commonly contingent matters is urged as an impediment, and it must be impeded [to marry]. On the other hand, if there be a presumption to the contrary, for instance, if a man hath sown near a vessel; then, as it is said in n. 18, marriages can with certainty be contracted without doubt. Furthermore, they probablistically say, Emanuel, t. i p. 406 n. 8. vers.

Fourthly, and concerning the opinion of Pichler, Diana thinks it probable in her treatise on page 4, third part. R. 17. (contra n. 28. quamvis in Decretum lib. 4 cap. 40 n. 26 videatur se retractasse) si aliquis Confessor electus fuerit pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. in impedimentis dubiis possit Episcopus dispensare. And this is commonly said by the Doctors generally speaking about all cases or impediments reserved to the Pontiff, when there is doubt whether they lack a dispensation, as in tr. 3. Decretum, lib. 6, cap. 5, nota 10, Cabassut. T.I. l.i.c. 8 n. 5. 6. i p. 147 n. 442. et eod. tit.

Decretum, distinguentes, caput 2, paragraph 3, nota 18. Reason, because from one side, although the dispensation of the impediments to this command is reserved to the Pope, nevertheless, Chapter II. Dub. II. On Marriage itself. 436 Given that reservation is odious, it must be strictly interpreted and restricted solely to certain cases, as we stated in a similar note n. 600.

From another aspect, it is quite probable that the Bishop may dispense in such a doubt, both ex c. Nuper, 29 de Sent. excom., where it says: Because, however, the founder of Car nonis himself absolved and did not specially retain, thereby it seems as if he had conceded the frugality of relating the akis. Thereupon the Gloss adds thus: And this is the argument, wherefore a Bishop may dispense when special dispensation has not been forbidden, and it seems to have been conceded if someone be chosen as Confessor in addition, which can then well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious, should be strictly interpreted for ordinary elections, not extraordinary ones. And this prohibition, if someone be chosen as Confessor in addition, can then well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious, should be strictly interpreted for ordinary elections, not

extraordinary ones, is not forbidden. See the aforementioned law no. 191 and below in this I. 6 no. 980. v. But dubium: And this is approved by presumed Sporer p. 4 c. 4 n. 22. Prior question chapter 2, point q-6, inasmuch as, when frequent cases occur where a lower dispensation can be granted in the matter of the Superior (as you have said according to common law n. 190), then the Bishop will well be able to dispense from impediments and doubts, if some Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may well be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as to apply to ordinary election, not extraordinary one; which prohibition against choosing a Confessor outside three years, if it occurs frequently, will lead to doubt regarding the necessity of dispensation. Question.

IV. During doubt, whether it preceded Marriage or came afterwards, the husband who doubts before diligent allowance for the reason necessitating the question cannot repeat, but can; and (if) he should happen to have goods lawfully given to another petitioner in good faith; that is acceptable according to c. Dominus, de Sec. nupt. where it says: Sonsuper Maritimeonis, quae quidem ea vobis (nondum habita obeun- tis conjugis certitudine) contraxerunt; id vobis respon- demus, ut nullus domus ad secundas nuptias migrave praesumat, donec ei constet, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. from hence life migrated-wards conjux ejus. Si vero aliquis hoc non servavit, et de morte conjugis adhuc existimat sibi dubitandum, ei, quae sibi nupsit, debitum non deneget postulant, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. a se tamen noverit nullatenus exigendum. And Irian's clear reason is, because in a doubt no one should be deprived of his certain right, if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, is

understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Psalm c. 15 n. 48. and elsewhere similarly.

Pontius says in idea 1, chapter 10, note 8: but here he assigns a different reason; saying, therefore it is right to oblige the doubtful penitent, because of the two evils the lesser ought to be chosen, according to Two Evils. But lesser is it to refrain from rendering what is due in a doubt than to refrain from not rendering it, because not rendering it entails the peril of injustice; whereas by rendering it there arises at once fornication, which is a lesser evil than injustice. But this reason did not hold; for if possession according to the second husband would not give her the right to claim, a greater evil of injustice would not be avoided, as Pontius supposed, while she was still exposed to the risk of injustice; otherwise, no penalty would be inflicted on him for the wrong done, unless perchance he lives. Wherefore it is necessary to recur to the first reason, and not to the certain law of possession, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement; for he can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. The second husband ought to be preferred to the uncertain right of the first husband, when there is doubt about his death. Therefore, whenever the wife's life regarding the first husband is not certain, it is held that the right to petition must be given to the second husband; and this even if there be a probable opinion concerning the invalidity of the second Marriage, but none for its value, because the second husband cannot lawfully lose his certain right except where there is certainty about the life of the first husband, as rightly taught by S. Croix 1. 6 part. 3 n. 3oo. with Card. Merolla, et Brexero, ac 2 D. 44 n. 3. cum Soto, Navar. Idem clarè probatur ex cap. Inquisitioni, de Sent excomm. ubi sic habebatur: Respondentes inquisitio tuw credimus distinguendum, utrum con- jugum pro certo sciat impedimentum conjugii, an non sciat pro certo sed credat.

In the preliminary case should one rather humbly endure the sentence of excommunication than commit a mortal sin through carnal commerce. In the second instance, we distinguish whether it has such a conscience through a light and presumptuous credulity, or through one that is probable and disarmed. And indeed, to the counsel of his Pastor (the explosion of credulity levity and temerity), it is licit for him not only to render but also to demand the conjugal debt. But when conscience urges the soul from credible and discreet credulity, though not evident and manifest, debt is due according to Chapter II. Dub.

II. Regarding marriage itself: it can indeed be given, but it should not be

requested, so as not to cause an offense either against one party or in violation of the law, or against a consenting judge. Note that partnership brings blindness: therefore if one certainly does not know, he is bound to make reparation. It is confirmed from the chapter: If a virgin. Caus. 34 qua. 2 ubi: Si virgo nupserit nesciens viro alieno, si semper nesciat, numquam ex hoc adultera erit; si autem sciât (nota), jam adultera esse incipit.

Where properly noted, c., with Sylvius, let her know [or: be known] to have been taken for certainty. The same is taught in 41 q. unic. art. 5 q. 1 ad 3 ibidem: Either it has a certain knowledge regarding impediment to Marriage, or an opinion; if primaarily, neither should it demand nor give; if secondarily, it should give, but not demand. Moreover it is said by St. Bonaventure in 4 D. 38. at the end: If certification is provided regarding the life of the first husband, neither should it petition nor repay. But he doubts. 1. If a good faith contract has been concluded in marriage, and if a doubt arises such that with due diligence it cannot be overcome, it may be permitted to the doubter not only to abstain from rendering, but also to presume and seek what is owed.

The first sentiment denies this, and likewise P. Soto, Medina, Sylv., and Conrad hold this according to 2 D. 42 num. 45. And concerning this judgment, it seems that a certain presumption is to be made. D. 38 in expositione litterae, ibi: Si oritur dubitatio de vita prioris viri, ex aliqua causa quae praesumptum certitudinem facere possit, non debet nec exigere debitum; si autem illa causa fecit probabilem dubitationem, debet reddere, sed non exigere. Idem sentit S. 38 sub fine dicens: Si probabiliter dubitat, debet reddere debitum, sed non exigere. That is confirmed from what was said in c. Inquisitioni, as mentioned above: Indeed, when conscience prompts the mind from a credible and discreet but not evident and manifest credulity, it can indeed render the debt, but ought not to demand it. The second opinion, far more common and probable, affirms this, and it is held by Soto in Justice 1, chapter 4, Dignitas 5, article final, Lugo same title.

Decretum, librum 17, caput 88. Decretum, librum 3, partem 4, sectionis 9 numeralis 6. Wigandt tr. 6 n, 59. Con. D, 34 dub. 10 n. 105. 6 R. 2. Habert t. 7 p. 82 q. qu. 4 Diana p. 3 tr. 4 R. 205. cum Val. et VII. cum cum . 6 p. 3 n. 302. cum . et Boss. ac . 1. 2 D. 41 num. 46. cum et probabilem tenent ib.

Canus, Victor. et Manuel. Reason, because he who has lawfully contracted Matrimony is not to be deprived of his right, if some Confessor is chosen for supplementation, well can it be confirmed by another triennium after

the time of supplementation; since prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it must be interpreted concerning an ordinary election and not extraordinary. It is possessed pending inquiry into impediment; nevertheless, if doubt supervenes, the right to possession is suspended until truth is ascertained, yet remaining in doubt after diligent search, since ignorance then becomes invincible, the possession remains for the value of Matrimony and consequently for its use: for he who holds in good faith can lawfully retain the thing possessed according to diligent inquiry and may thus presume to make use of that power. This reason adequately confirms from C. Laudabilem, de frigid. et malef., where in doubt about the value of Matrimony, on account of the dubiety of the impotence of the Conjuges to copulation, is conceded the space of a triennium for due petition: in such measure, therefore, is granted to them permission to petition in this doubt, inasmuch as they have contracted by good faith, and consequently possess the right to petition, until it be made certain by the experiment of a triennium that the impediment of impotence is truly present. To the text cited in c. Inquisitioni, the aforementioned authors respond multiple times: Lugo de Jus. D. 17 n. 88. dictum: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.

The Pontiff speaks here about the case where the Conjugus has only a probability of the invalidity of the Matrimony, and no probity regarding its value. Others however more commonly and correctly, as Sotus says in loco citato and responds with Conink, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood strictly and odiously concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood strictly and odiously concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; that text is to be understood as forbidding the request before due diligence has been made; otherwise after diligence; then indeed (as above has already been said) the Spouse remains in possession of her own jurisdiction, practically depositing the doubt under this reflex principle: if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because

the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood strictly and odiously concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; that text is to be understood as forbidding the request before due diligence has been made; otherwise after diligence; then indeed (as above has already been said) the Spouse remains in possession of her own jurisdiction, practically depositing the doubt under this reflex principle: in dubio melior sit conditio possidentis. And truly the text, saying that the believing spouse cannot petition, presupposes that he has not formed this practical judgment of conscience up to now, Cap. II. Dub. II.

Regarding marriage itself. Resolving the doubt, if it is given [i.e., exists], one cannot ask for it: That in either case or against the law of conjugal union, or contrary to the judgment of conscience, a sinner may not commit an offense. Hence it appears how necessary it is in moral matters to admit, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, that he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict as it is considered regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, may licitly be set aside through reflex principles; for if these are denied, no reason appears why what the Pontiff has already declared to be licit should be deemed licit. He rightly observed that a doubting person cannot have his debt paid double before the preceding diligence, even if the petitioner is in good faith, because at that time another does not have the right to petition. And likewise it is said, if another petitioner be deprived of his right to petition through incest or adultery. Doubt. 2.

And he says: But if one who has contracted [something], through incest or adultery be deprived of the right to petition. A bona fide marriage, 905: Whether a conjuge having a probable reason for the invalidity of the marriage and none for its value can petition after due diligence has been given? The first opinion denies, and those maintain this. 2. D: 41 n. 3 et 43 n. 2. Lugo of Bon., q. 4, p. 5, n. 13.

Reg: et Hi dicunt, conjugem taliter opinantem tenêri ad reddendum alteri qui bonâ fide contraxit, sed petere non posse. Reason, because possession confirms a doubtful matter, but does not confirm merely an opinionative sense as if it rendered the Marriage null. However, the second opinion sufficiently probable affirms this, and they hold this. D. 3 p. 4 § 9 n. n. 6 with Conink. and Croix l. 6 p. 3 n. 302. They, however, say that this conjugal union should not be dissolved even after petitioning with diligence, removing doubt, and forming conscience according to the same rule mentioned above, namely, if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can adequately be confirmed through another triennium following the

time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, should not deprive anyone of their rightful certainty. No one who possesses goods in good faith should be deprived of his right if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can adequately be confirmed through another triennium following the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict applies to ordinary election rather than extraordinary.

D. 13 q. 6 n. 85 cum l. c. n. 3. In hoc enim differre videtur, qui bona fide ab eo qui mala fide contraxit; nam possessor malae fidei non potest petere, ut dicunt . 2. D. 42 n. 2. n. 77 et qui tuentur tunc sufficiere, si post diligentiam dubium deponatur, ut videbimus in Du- bio sequenti); possessor autem bonæ fidei post dili- gentiam factam petyre potest, semper ac non constet de nullitate Matrimonii, quia possessio præbet ei jus certum petendi, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. prævalet cuicumque probabi- litati oppositæ: probabilitas enim, cum sit opinati- va, et consequenter semper includat formidinem in opinione contentam, auferre nequit legitimam præ- sumptionem validitatis Matrimonii, ortam ex ipsa possessione conjugii bona fide contracti. See what we have said in a similar case, l. 1. n. 84. This is confirmed from c. Laudabilem de Frigid. et malef. where in doubt concerning impotence, Conjugibus is conceded a period of three years to experiment; for I ask, if after two years the Conjux still shall not be able to consummate, whether it is probable that the Marriage is valid?

Certainly is it most improbable; and conversely it is most probable that then there be none at all: yet nevertheless, on account of this very fact, the spouses may continue to experiment until the end of the three years; I ask you, by what reason? Not otherwise than because the Marriage is not yet certainly null, nor have they as yet been deprived of possession sufficiently. Furthermore, even their opponents concede that the Conjugem is held to be bound to render, even if there exists merely a probability of the nullity of the Marriage; and they cannot deny this, since it has been expressly stated in the aforementioned canon of Inquisitioni. And the reason is indeed that no one ought to be deprived of his lawful possession until it has been determined to be void ab initio. Therefore, congruent, despite that one single assentative opinion for nullity, a Doubting Spouse cannot deny another debt, lest he deprive him of his certain possession; thus after diligence he is not himself bound by such mere opiniative

conscience to divest himself of his own certain possession, unless he is sure, if some Confessor be chosen for supplement, that he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be received concerning ordinary rather than extraordinary election; which, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be received regarding ordinary rather than extraordinary election. No right can pertain to him. But it is said solely out of an opinionative conscience; which see Chapter II.

Dub. II. Regarding marriage itself, let it contain doubt and not reach certainty; for if a spouse has reasons so convincing regarding the nullity of the Marriage that they found in them moral certitude, then certainly neither can ask nor give satisfaction. Furthermore, it rightly observes Croix n. 301 etc., with the Cardinal, that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict in respect of ordinary election, but not extraordinary, it is such that, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict concerning an ordinary election, but not one that is extraordinary. If one who doubts still has hope of finding greater certitude, then he cannot ask for it, because, since the doubt remainsvincible, he may not make use of the right of asking. Dubium tertium.

Whether one who has contracted a marriage with doubt concerning faith 906 regarding an impediment may, after due diligence, petition for what is owed him while the doubt still persists? The first opinion, more common, denies this, and those hold it: page 3, note 4, number 6 etc., and page 2. D. 42. n. 2., quando probatur secundum duas rationes, quia nemo potest uti re quam mala fide incepit possidere; unde si non potest dubium deponere, numquam petere potest. The second opinion, however, sufficiently probable affirms this, and those uphold it, p. 404 n. 146. Reason: because, suppose a doubter, he cannot remove doubt from the title of possession; nevertheless, he can remove it from other principles, namely first, because in dubium standum est pro valore actus, as stated in the law.

How often, the authorities on matters doubtful. Secondly, because, since Matrimony is a favorable cause, in dubio standum pro ejus valore, as it is

proven in 1 D. 18 n. 6 cum Cov. Lopez et Menoch. Eò si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta ac-cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Congruent in foro externo in dubio judicandum est pro valore Matrimonii juxta communem sententiam ibi ex c. fin. de Nec obstat textus oppositus in d. c. Dominus quia ibi sermo fit de contrahente cum dubio de morte prioris Conjugis quo casu certum est, dubitantem non posse petere donec constet de illius morte; nam aliàs potius est jus prioris Matrimonii. This, however, pertains to the spouse who contracted in an uncertain faith; but otherwise as regards the spouse who contracted in good faith, as we said in n. 904. Commonly however they say 1.

D. 42 n. 8. c. et Aversa, etc., si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Praesumptum contractum matrimonio cum dubia fide possit dubitans petere, si matrimonium reputetur probabiliter validum; praesumptum si probabilius sit, esse nullum, ut dicunt. This must be admitted with the utmost reluctance; for in a doubt regarding the death of the prior spouse, whether the marriage has been initiated with good faith or with doubtful faith, never can the one who doubts petition, unless there is had certainty regarding the death of the prior spouse, or at least such a presumption which establishes moral certainty. Otherwise, if there is merely a probability of death, never may that husband doubt and petition, because then remains a possible danger of injury to the prior spouse, according to what was said in the Treatise on Conscience, which I myself composed; moreover, because in that case he already possesses the marriage before its dissolution has been established. Dubit. 4. In dubio positivo de valore Matrimonii, puta si dubitetur de impedimento vel de consensu praesumptione et simili, judicandum sit in favorem Matrimonii contracti? Outside of internal forum, in case of doubt, it must be affirmed without hesitation, as commonly teach the doctors.

See 1. disp. 18 n. 5. But in the forum of conscience some deny that if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious and strict, as it is to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary one; hence,

in doubt, liberty from the burden of marriage prevails. But rather the opposite is true, as Pontius holds in lib. 8 c. 2 n. 16. et 1 c. 3 v. Monoch. et communi. Reason, because although Marriage is only probatively valid, its possession is certain; until it be established as null and void; for in doubt (as I have said), according to Palaus tr. 28, judgment is always to be made in favor of validity of the act.

D. 3 p. 4 §. 9 n. 4. Bussem. Elb. 1. c. et Cprix 1. 6 p. 3 n. 298 ex 1. quoties ff. de reb. dqb. To discern, how one can be certain or probatively doubtful about the nullity of Matrimony, three rules are given; The first is, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received seriously for ordinary election, not extraordinary; when speaking ordinarie, the husband should not be bound to believe that he has assented to another's assertion, even if he asserts it with an oath, according to c. Per tuas, de et attest., where: It is excessively improper, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received seriously for ordinary election, not extraordinary; whoever having protested by his own voice may validly invalidate that with his own testimony. It is said, speaking in a regular sense: namely, if otherwise it should be considered on account of circumstances, for instance, if the husband were at the point of death, if he did not usually violate his vows, or if he were a pious person who desired to separate or enter religion, etc., then another has sufficient reason to prudently doubt. Thus, it is stated in Diana 3, tract 4.

R. 2. 2. D. 43 n. 3 cum Soto, Adriano, . . 15 n. 52 cum et Secunda regula est, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si quis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria; si quis audiat à personis non fide dignis vel ex fama à nullo auctore certo exorta adesse impedimentum licitè potest Matrimonium contrahere aut post contractum reddere et petere debitumquia talis fama aut dictum non habetur ut ratio prudens dubitandi; 6 item et Bonac. l.c. n. 20. Third rule is, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time

of supplement, because the prohibition concerning non-chosen Confessor beyond triennium, as odious, strict and to be received, relates to ordinary election not extraordinary. For, if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning non-chosen Confessor beyond triennium, as odious, strict and to be received, relates to ordinary election not extraordinary. The dictum of one credible witness regarding impediment or public fame from certain author (as they say Dic). Sylv. Et quia, cum talis ignorantia tunc sit vincibilis, in dubio non potest operari. It is nevertheless insufficient to hold oneself bound to negate; for although one might be able to do so, no one is nevertheless bound to believe even a credible witness, however worthy of credit, who does not bring about the necessity of believing, especially to his own prejudice, according to c. Cum à nobis de d. n. 54.

After due diligence has been employed, it can properly render and request, as those same Sylvius say. Ang. et Lop. • III. If it occurs with a serious risk to life or health: 999 » Unless however there be a grave cause, whose bodily harm seems to be postponed, for instance a danger of incontinence in itself, or one that arises in comparison. Perez d. 50 s. 4 n. 5. » Doubt 1.

Permit it to seek with danger. For the sake of health, unless otherwise the labor of conjugation or leprosy, or a Gallic disease, phthisis, or any contagious disease? To speak with a person is not permitted, when the lord has forbidden it for His own life or salvation; nevertheless, probably Busemb. according to what was said above regarding Bonac. and Perez, and chapter 9. D. 2 4 n. 2 3 cum Cajet. P. Soto, Graff. item Boss. c. 1 n. 1 9 5 e t 2 0 9 cum Pont. dicunt, quod simi rbus seddi - turn us et non proxime tendens ad mortem, nempe quod non solct debri vi facili mi mor ten im inferre ut esset pestis aut le pra leonina (qua frustatim membra decidunt), tunc non sit futurum illicitum sanop petere si aderit juxta cau sa, nimirum fovendi amor conjuga - lem aut vitandi incontinentiam insve linalter o, quia aliass esset valde onerosum tam diu abstinere ab usu conjugii, quod vix poterit esse sine periculoinconti - mentiæ. However, it must be noted that a husband infected with a gallic or similar contagious disease will not be able to approach another knowingly, nor will his sin be completely manifest unless the infection is made apparent by other means; and even then he cannot offer remedy to recover from the disease if the affected have not been properly restored to health.

Here indeed Bossius c. 1 n. c 1 8 0 states that he who labors under a contagious disease lacks twofold, that in sending forth the infection he does not labor; and in exceeding beyond what is necessary to sustain himself he does not compensate expenses of procurators: Yet this

compensation excuses women however, unless they purposely conceal their disease so as to defraud others. No, the conjugal infection cannot be concealed, nor can the disease be manifested. Cæterum rumoris non tenetur manifestare, quianon tenetur cum tanto detrimento suæ famæ conjugalet debitum præstare: In omnibus enim contrectationibus gravissimum incongruum in solutione excusat debitoreddendo, ut ita. Dic. c. 3 §. 5 n. 1 3 cum Soto, juxta dicendum insimilicas unam. 4 9 1. Not allowed to bathe immediately either in the baths, or after Chapter II.

Doubt. II. Of marriage itself. At that time, according to them, due to the vein's condition, namely, as S. Ant. and Fill. say in c. 1 n. 171 with St. Augustine: at that time coitus is notably perilous. They also say in Bon. 1, c. Pont. 1, 10, c. 14, n. 3: The same applies to Croix de viri coeundi cum uxore laborante gonorrhoea; for it is written that the semen flows forth with the flux. But some physician asserted to me that such a copulation would be but minimally harmful neither to man nor woman. Moreover, it does not appear that copulation is then prohibited, since such fluxes are accustomed to be nearly perpetual, whence a serious inconvenience would arise for Conjug们在努力工作。

Nevertheless, it is to be received, unless the flux be malefic; and then the presumed excuse is allowed for coitus, if there be danger of incontinence both in the petitioner and in the respondent, as stated in the following article preceding this one. But a man laboring under flux of semen can always lawfully seek to relieve himself, because coitus brings no harm either to himself, or to his wife, or to procreation, thus g D. 11 n. g. It seems likewise not to be permissible to request immediately after a meal, for they say in Pontius lib. 11 c. 14 n. 3. Bonac. qu. 4 p. 1 n. 6 1. g d. 24 n. 4 cum Vega: si conjuges sæpè excusari reddendo tali tempore, eò si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Coitus soleat tunc af- ferre grave damnum ob ciborum cruditatem vel corruptionem quam causat. It refers to someone who fell into leprosy for this reason, S. 16 § 10.

But it is said, that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict as it is in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, since, were this true, almost all Conjuges would escape phthisis. However, doctors whom I consulted and experience deny a serious damage to be present in this. Hence I would not dare to condemn a Conjugem petitioning after meals, since this is commonly observed to do so shortly

after a meal or after dining. Neither, however, on this account would I condemn the Conjugem from confessing, unless experience certifies it, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is, like that regarding the ordinary election, to be understood as odious and strict, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation; because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is, like that regarding the ordinary election, to be understood as odious and strict, not extraordinary. Such coitus has caused notable harm either to themselves or the other; Otherwise it is certain they ought to confess even with some or slight impediment, according to what is said n. g50 v. It is asked. Book 466.

VI. Treatise. VI. On Marriage. he: Doubt is raised number two. Is it permissible to demand a debt during lactation?

Others deny it, as Butrus does, and another author at [specific location]. D. 22 n. 13 say it is mortal; for in c. fin. Dictionary 5. D. Gregory says: But as regards his own concubine, a man ought not to approach her (ought not, but it is not seemly, as it is explained); for in such copulation there is fear of harm to offspring, if the wife conceive. However, most commonly it is affirmed that the Pope permits this in his book 10, chapter 14, note 9.

Croix n. 326. c. n. 14 cum Ricch. Turrecr. c. 1 n. 214 cum Con. Gregorius, dicunt Holzrn 1. c. et item, quia peri culum inficiendi lac, teste experientia, rarum est; saltèm non tantum ut tenean:ur conjuges tam tumo tempore abstinere ab usu conjugii, cum continuo periculo peccandi. They nevertheless accept what Pontius says in loco citato, namely, that at such a time (as he explains) neither must one be held to render, nor can one demand it, if the danger of incontinence is presumptively present; because it is not lawful for one to consult with harm to an innocent party, since other means are available to moderate incontinence. However, note n. 11), but they dare not damn the one who demands, saying that if a Confessor should be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the period of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in terms of ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Then either some other way may itself consult for the future, or there may be a just cause exposing it to risk, so that couples are not so long deprived of conjugal intercourse with such difficulty. An autem Conjuges peccent, respectu prolis, petendo tempore prægnationis, vel menstrui aut purgationis post partum?

See nos. 924, 925, and 926. And what if the spouses suffer from leprosy? See no. 951. Whether, however, it is permitted to cohabit during menstruation? See no. 925. g2 IV.

If a false end is made, for instance, only on account of eighth cause of pleasure, if a Confessor be chosen as supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Nevertheless, Doctors commonly hold, as Cap. II. Doubtful. II. On Marriage in itself. 46y 1.9 n. 11. 6 they hold that it is merely venial, against Pontius who wishes for there to be none: for there will be none if a sought-after delight is not perceived or excited when the necessary copulation is performed. .9 d. 11 etc. See presumed Diana p. 3 t. 4. Response 216.

Perez d. 46s. 2 n. 6. It is certain that having conjugal intercourse for the sole sake of pleasure is illicit, as is evident from what he says: "The act of marriage performed for the sole sake of pleasure lacks entirely guilt and venial fault." It is nevertheless commonly held by all, that this is not a mortal, but still a venial sin: thus 9 D. 11 n. 4. Pont. 1. 1 c. 21 n. 6 et 11. Theorem is not first, as appears, nor second, as is supposed.

Non excusatur autem a veniali, quia est perversio quaedam ordinis, cum delectatio, qua intenta est à natura ut medium ad generationem, fit finis habendae copulae. No peccatum autem erit, ut rectè dicit Croix n. 296 et q. 3 a. 2 n. 4, si conjugus principaliter intendat procreationem proli et utatur voluptate (eam moderatè intendens), ut se excitet ad copulam; congruent pariter minimè peccatum, qui intendit modératam delectationem in comedendo, ad præstantum corpori conveniens alimento. If a conjugal act is performed with an adulterous mind, as when, while acceding to one's spouse, one imagines another, causing the soul to pass over, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. This is a mortal sin. They are excused from mortal sin according to 9 D. 16 n. 16 and Conjugem, who might excite himself to copulation by delighting in the beauty of another person, but without a base affection; whereas they rightly say that this is very dangerous and not to be permitted. I do not think that it is fitting nor presumptuous to permit that Diana, engaging in coitus with diverse images, might be found congruent: especially if they were sacred; for if a

Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious and strict as it is regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. This, rightly, say Croix n. 32g et seq.

An autem liceat Marito delectari de copula aliena cogitata, ut se excitet ad coitum cum uxore? From one aspect it seems that this should be denied, since the object on which he delights is by itself shameful. And on the other hand it does not seem that such a wife should be condemned, since with the prohibition of illicit sight of human copulation, or of the thought of such copulation in vision, there is removed also an occasion for danger to the spirits through motion leading to generation; and since coition itself is prohibited, consequently the motion of the spirits is also forbidden; but to married persons, although coition has already been permitted to them, it does not seem that a slight motion of such spirits, which arises from that very delight, should be forbidden with grave censure. Yet this very thought, if it were about a copulation between determined persons, would not be excused from mortal sin on account of the easy danger of consenting to delight in copulation with another's spouse. Cæteris, quia hoc dubium apud nullum inveni discussum, Sapientibus remitto decidendum.

That other thing, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary one; this opinion Arriaga de Peccat considers probable. D. 47 n. 16, 'nam licitum esse marito delectari de coitu cogitato inter ipsum et alienam dico cum Croix n. 33 omnino rejecendum cum talis delectatio sit objecto intrinsecè malo et ipsi coniugi omnino vetito VI.' If it be made in an undue manner, for instance 1. If not "the natural vessel" is preserved: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary election and not extraordinary. Many hold that "this is verath sodorhiam," others consider it a grave sin against nature; V.6. Praecep. 2.

If it be situated without just cause in iur naturali, praeposterus etc., si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius

eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. some hold it to be mortal, others, secluded by the peril of effusion of seed, venide tantùm, etsi grave, et graviter im- credendum. 204. 3. If on account of moroseness or some other reason one spouse shall curtail intercourse: if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly in reference to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. For some say generically that it is mortal, since the end of the conjugal act, namely generation, is concerned. Dub. II. On Marriage in itself.

Neratio is impeded; yet certain ones, as Prepositus et P. et Y. 15 et p. 1. » Question NoneI. How is a mortal sin committed by a man beginning an act improperly in a vessel, so that afterwards in vessels: does she owe it accordingly? They deny it. 1. 5 Consilium concerning Penitence.

Consensus et Anglicana. Zerola, Graff., p. 2, tr. 17, R. 37: modo absit periculum pollutionis; quia alias (ut ajunt) omnes tacitus velerei non sunt graviter illiciti inter conjugatos. But commonly and variously they affirm. 1 D. 17 n. 5. Pope 1:10 c:11 n:5. Sporer n. 497. . 7 c. 3 § 5 n. 31 » et Perez, Aversa, Batio, quia ipse hujusmodi coitus (etsi absque seminatio) est vera sodomia, quamvis non consummata, congruent ipsa copula in vase naturali muliebris alienae est vera fornicatio, licet non adsit seminationis.

Etiam autem est peccatum mortalis, si vir perferat suam virilitatem circa vas praeparatum alienae uxoris? They deny it, and Perez says that because touching the mouth of a posterior vessel is not ordered to sodomitic copulation. But equally truly they affirm Pontius in the aforementioned place. Diana p. 4. tr. 4 R. 104 et p. 5 tract. 7 R. 7 item: etc., apud n. 32 (qui testatur ex aliquibus codicibus septentiam Thomae; imo Moya assexit, ipsum in editione Antuerpismi anni 1614.) Retior est, quia saltem talis tactus non potest marginaliter fieri sine affectu sodomitico. Question None

II. And how do married couples sin when going in a natural situation? The natural position is for the woman to lie as a reclining supine (accuba), and the man as an incubus; for this mode is more apt for the effusion of seminal fluid, and for its reception in the female receptacle for the purpose of procreating offspring. A situs inuaturalis est, si coitus aliquote fat, id est, sedendo, stando, de latere, vel praeposterè more cadum; vel si vir sit succubus, et mulier incuba. This coitus, besides the natural position, is also found among certain authors in the Fourth Book.

VI. Treatise. VI. On Marriage. . Decretum 16, n. 2 generically condemns mortal sin; others however say that mortal sin is found in the last two modes, saying that this very nature they abhor. But commonly others say that all these modes do not exceed venial guilt.

Reason, because on one hand, although there is some disproportion, yet itself does not reach such a degree as to amount to mortal sin, since it revolves solely around the accidentalities of copulation; on the other hand, the change in position does not hinder generation, since the semen of the man is not received in the womb of the woman through infusion or descent, but through attraction, while the womb naturally attracts virile semen; thus S. M. Pontifex 1. 10 c. 11 n. 1. Third case. . 458. Sporer n. 493. Cross nu. 332. . D. 3 p. 4 § 3 n. 1 cum Sa, Tolet. 1. 9 D. 16 n. 3 cum Gers.

Caj. P. Soto, Dom. Soto Sylv. Th. in IV D. 31 in fine in exp. litt. ubi sic ait: Sed in secundo modo (nempe mutando situm naturalem) non semper est peccatum mortale, ut quidam dicunt, sed potest esse signum mortalis concupiscentiae. Therefore, according to D. Thomas, a change in position per se is not mortal, but can become mortal through wicked concupiscence, for instance through an affection of bestiality or sodomy; and if such is not love procreating offspring but delight in the work of coition, it should be considered as the ultimate end.

Hence commonly do the aforementioned authors say, with Concina p. 403 n. 2. Conjuges minimae peccare possunt si mutent situm ex justa causa, scilicet propter aegritudinem, vel pinguedinem viri, vel propter periculum abortus aut scandali aliorum: id Angelicus loco citato expresse habet: Quandoque sine peccato esse potest; quando dispositio corporis alium modum non patitur; aliis tanto est gravius quantum magis a naturali modo receditur. On the contrary all agree (as they assert in the cited place), if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as to be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. For, if experience should show this, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as to be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. For, when the natural situation is changed, no female seed would be retained in an excessively lax vessel or soil. Cap. II. Dub. II.

On Marriage itself. 472 corruption, or on account of some natural infirmity, as Palaus says, then it would be mortal: otherwise, however, it would be so stated. They say however, n. 5. Pont. d. c. 11 n. 3. n. 1 et si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. dicunt : aliquando evenire; imo ferè semper evenire ajunt. But certain it is that they say, c. 493 with Aversa: a Confessor ought not to be held responsible for inquiring of his penitent's spouse whether she has shed seed or not, because this rarely happens; and thus also I have heard from many who confessed to me that they had illicitly cohabited. These, however, who cohabit while standing, or sitting, or with a woman lying down, are more likely to be in greater danger of seminal effusion.

Sed per hoc non audeo damnare sententiam; nam possent ipsi ., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. sine justa causa prodigere semine, sive (ut melius; quia tunc matrix, ut dicunt AA., praefati, jam attrahit si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. est sufficiens ad generationem, et re tamquam superfluum expellit. Whether, however, the husband is bound to add a debt due to another in an unnatural situation without just cause? see no. 946 for explanation. Question NoneIII. Whether married persons, by way of mortal sin, hold back conception in coitus?

Response: si conjuges ambo in hoc consentiunt, nec adsit periculum seminandi extra vas, id per se loquendo non est mortale; illa enim penetratio vasis feminei tunc reputatur instar tactus verendorum, qui inter conjuges permittitur, vel saltem non est mortalis, secluso periculo pollutionis; ita communiter s. pont. 1. 10 c. 11 n. 9. Laying 1. 6 section 14 note 19. 4 chapter 3 note 55. Sporer n. 490. c. 9 n. 58 cum 1. 9. D. 19 n. 3 cum Sa, Arm., si ambo consentiunt; nam si alter se retrahit sine alterius consensu, certe graviter peccat, ut omnes AA. praefati dicunt. I have spoken.

By itself speaking, for he wisely observed, c. with Veracrux; this ordinarily is mortal. Because ordinarily there is a danger of effusing semen from such a retraction unless the Conjuges are experienced otherwise: in which case I think they can in no way be excused even if they say anything else with others. If however a woman has already sown seed, or is in a probable danger of sowing seed, then without grave fault her husband cannot withdraw from the work of sowing seed, because then he himself becomes the cause that the husband's seed is wasted, commonly say St. Augustine 1. c. 1 Caj. If however a woman has already conceived, or is in a probable risk of conception, then without grave guilt the man cannot withdraw himself from the act of begetting seed, because then he himself becomes the cause that his wife's seed may be wasted, commonly say S. Anthony 1. c. 1 Caj. Yes, and others similarly. This nevertheless will not be so intrinsically evil but that it could be permitted in some case, for instance if a man should cease from carnal acts due to the fear of death or scandal for others; then he may lawfully withdraw presumptuously with the danger of pollution, because this comes by chance and against one’s intention, and therefore is not bound contrary to the danger of procuring such a great harm. Thus commonly Sench. d. n. 4 3 p. tr. 4 R. 204 Aversa; et Perez. And if, moreover, a man has already sown, there arises doubt whether a woman commits mortal sin by withdrawing from sowing? or does the man commit mortal sin by waiting for his wife to sow?

The first opinion differs, and this is held by Averra, Hurter, and c. 9 n. 5r, and is proven in Cap. II. Dub. II. On Marriage itself. 475 bilem putat . 5 tr. i4 R. 37. and it seems to cohere with Tab. et l. gd. ig n. 5 while indistinctly saying that it is mortal if the wife withdraws from semination by another sower. Reason, because (as they say) presumptuous seed of a woman actively concurring contributes to generation, as they judge from Hippocrates, Galenus, Valesius, and Petrus Matha in 2 D 21 n. 11, and from theologians in 10 sectio 1 v.

Secondly, it is inferred where he says: The maternal seed simply is necessary to conceive a child. Moreover, D. d. n. 60 and Caj. l. c., and themselves think this opinion sufficiently probable; at least (says Bossuet) the seed of woman contributes very much to the perfection of the offspring, since nature has instituted it for this purpose at least. However, the more common opinion denies this, and those who hold it say so: g D. ig n. 5 Pont. l. io c. 11 n. 2 c. 15 n. 80. with Cajetan et al. to the contrary, relying on the basis that if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in regard to ordinary election,

but not extraordinary, is applicable. They assert that the seed of woman is not necessary for generation, contrary to Aristotle, Avicenna, Galen, and Hugo Senensis, and Alb. M. ap. g D. 17 n. g. qui ait, hanc esse sententiam communem Theologiomm, exceptis Scotistis. They do not say that the doctors of this second opinion object if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, and it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict as it is considered in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, since the seed of the female confers perfection to the offspring; now they respond that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict as it is considered in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. since spouses are not bound to a more convenient mode of generation, but it is sufficient if they do not obstruct generation.

Although however the aforementioned AA. say that a man is not bound to await the woman's conception, if he himself has already fathered children: yet they nonetheless grant him permission to continue copulation until she conceives, because this pertains to the completion of conjugal union, as stated by cc. et . 17 n. 11 with Tab. and Graff. contra c.), who say that a man is not bound to await the woman's conception, for there is danger in such a manner that conception may be impeded. If a Confessor were elected for supplementary service, he might well be confirmed through another three-year period after the supplementary term, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, is intended for ordinary election, not supplementary one, as stated by cc., if a Confessor were elected for supplementary service, he might well be confirmed through another three-year period after the supplementary term, because the prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict, is intended for ordinary election, not supplementary one. It does not seem sufficiently probable nor coherent; for if such danger were present, it should have been said that he 'cannot', rather than merely that he 'is not bound to await'. No one asserts this, for no one supposes such a danger. But returning to the first question, although it is indeed more common and seems probable, I nonetheless deem the first opinion sufficiently probable and hence sufficient for practice. Reason, because it is not allowed to follow a probable opinion when harm comes to a third party; but since here harm against the offspring or generation contrary to nature is being considered, which has the right not to have its generation impeded, as the conjugal act was instituted for this purpose, therefore where there is danger of impeding generation, it is not allowed to use a probable opinion;

for in such matters (as we said in lib. i n. 33), not the honorability of the action but the truth of things is at issue, and it is illicit to follow (as all acknowledge) a probable opinion for liberty against another standing for law. Hereupon I do not consider it practically probable that if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a three-year period is to be received with odium and strictness regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary one, as stated in n. 49t cum Perez, Escob. It is said and held by Dict. and Gob. that indeed a woman can direct her mind in the act to other things, so as not to be stirred up to conception.

Nam et si vir se retrahat post seminationem mulieris, sed ante seminationem ipsius mulieris, possit ipsa statim tactualibus se excitare ut seminet? They deny that the Author Adds. to Wigandt, tom. 16, after no. 106, and ap. Bossuet, lib. 9, n. 54, adhaeretque (dicendo id non esse licitum si mulier posset se continere). Ratio est quia semen mulieris non est necessarium ad generationem; etiam quia effusio illius mulieris, ut possibiliter separata, non fit una caro cum viro. However, they commonly affirm in common, Wigandt tractatus 16, note 103, verse. Examine. . 4 c. 3 n. 94 in fine cum 9 D. 17 n. 10 10 1 c. 3 § 5 n. 18 in fine cum dicit.

Fill. tr. 10 n. 33o c. 9 n. 55. cum Aversa, Perez, p. 479 n. 425. cum Cleric. et Bosco; et non reprobat Concilium p. 406 n. 11. Reason, because it pertains to the seeding of woman; Chapter II. Doubt. II. Concerning Marriage in itself. 475 In order to complete the conjugal act, which consists in the seminal emission of both spouses; hence, a wife may lawfully prepare herself through caresses for coition, because if women at least were to retain nature after arousal, they would be exposed to great danger of sinning frequently, since men, being warmer, emit semen sooner (but this reason does not persuade, for if permission were given to wives, it should also be given to men, so that the husband might cool off in the same manner as a woman withdraws herself after her emission; but the Doctors commonly say that it is forbidden husbands to do this, according to Can.); furthermore, because, as many hold, female seminal emission is necessary, or at least greatly contributes to generation: for nature does nothing in vain.

All allow that wives who are of a colder nature can stimulate themselves through touch before copulation, so as to seminate immediately upon their marital congress; see «VII.». If in an improper place, for example, Sacro, qui indego « violetur, vel in loco publico * (Vide dicta de hoc « puncto 1. 3 num. 485. ubi diximus cum . » 6 n. 364. Because the Church is not considered polluted if someone is chosen as Confessor for

supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received seriously in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary, which, if someone is chosen as Confessor for supplementation, can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be received seriously in regard to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. » celebrationem Officiorum, nisi crimen sit notorium » notorietate facti. » VIII.

If it is done without urgent cause at a time when one ought not to be engaged, such as during great solemnities, like those of Easter or before communion. V. Si absque urgentiore causa fiat tempore indebito, i.e., bito in magna solemnitate, ut Paschæ vel pri- diè communionis. By decree 49, section 2, article 2. When the wife is pregnant, at least if there is danger of abortion. n. 337. This indeed, if it is not so, will not be at least mortal: if a Confessor shall be elected for supplement, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition concerning non-election of a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict it should be received in ordinary election, not in extraordinary, for then the finalization of its seed frustrously would follow from the act: hence in R. 204 and Con. d. 34 dub. 9 there are no acknowledged sins. 3.

When the wife labors with a menstrual flow. If a confessor be elected for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a confessor be elected for supplementation, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; yet it is not mortal, contra 1. g d. 21 n. a. But some among c. ut Pontificalium l. 10 c. 11 and c. 14 n. 5 and 6 teach that it is not venial, if danger threatens, when a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be taken seriously is regarding the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one; that is to say, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition

against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious, strict and to be taken seriously is regarding the ordinary election, not the extraordinary one. The canon teaches that this is probable; and M has added it. Perez, si ob finem honestum fiat, nulla esset; et teneri reddere debitum uxorem, si maritus exigat. See distinction 49 session 3.

§22 Question NoneI. Is it licit for the husband to copulate on the day of communion? The light which we have already explained in 1.6 n. 273 and 274, where we held that it is venial to approach the Eucharist on the day of copulation for pleasure, unless some reasonable excuse be provided. If, however, the conjunction is held for the cause of begetting offspring, or even for the vice of incontinence to be avoided, then one should abstain from Holy Communion only out of counsel, according to c. Si vir 7, Can. 33, q. 7.

And thus likewise it is a matter of counsel to abstain on the day when Conjux repaid the debt; from which, however, by paying, properly speaking, one cannot be excused on account of Communion; for at times it can be resisted through honest prayers. What, however, ought the Confessor to reply to the Conjugal party inquiring whether it is permissible to render satisfaction on the day of Communion? See d. n. 274. v. What. But after the reception of Communion there is no sin to make reparation.

And what about asking for? Some say it is venial; others, none; see thereabove, chapter five. But as for asking. Section 23 Inquiry. II. On the days of feasts, or of fasts, or of Rogations, it is commonly held that then a conjugal act ought not to be illicit; hence in due time should one render what is debited, according to q. 64 art. 7 where it is said: When a woman has power over the body of a man... and conversely, each is bound to render what is debited with whomever the time and whatever the hour.

Whether, however, it is permissible to ask for it? The first opinion affirms, and holds this, Canon against Alexander I, chapter 8, section 20: § ii Sentences of Alberic. M. Mire. Guards.

Sylv. l. g d. 12 n. 3. This, however, under a venial fault, as he says: but not under a mortal fault, as some say, Chapter II. Dub. II. On Marriage itself. Probabiliter hold they among .

D.) to be drawn into another species of sin, whence it cannot be indefinitely aggravated. Now as regards the reason why it is venial: the same Angelic doctor assigns this saying: Although the marital act may lack any guilt: nonetheless, because it depresses the reason on account of carnal

deliberation, it renders a man inept in spiritual matters. And thus on those days in which there is especial necessity for spiritual things, it is not permitted to seek a debt. The second one more commonly denies it to be illicit, and this they hold with 9 d. 12 n. 5 and St. Bonaventure Scotus, Cajetan Arm. Soto, 10 c. 9 per totum. c. 7. n. 84 cum .

Fill. Perez; etc. The reason is because this is not prohibited by any law: neither divine, for on feast days alone are servile works forbidden; nor ecclesiastical, for on feast days and fasts, despite the meeting of marriage, spouses may observe what is commanded. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, should be understood similarly. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be adequately confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary, should be understood similarly. if Canons and SS. Fathers seem to expressly prohibit the use of conjugal intercourse on those days, say the aforementioned authors; this they intend by counsel, not by precept, in order to strive much to prove it. In canons, and other interpreters. Questio.

III. Is it permitted for conjugal intercourse to occur at a time predetermined by pregnancy? It is common that this not be mortal sin unless there be a risk of abortion; thus all with . d. 22 n. 3. Pontifex 1, 10, c. 14, n. 7; c. 15, n. 78; c. 9, n. 33 ex Decretis Augustini de Bono Conjugali, caput 6, ubi: conjugialis enim concubitus generandi gratia non habet culpam: concupiscendi odii satiandae sed tamen propter fidem tortu veniale habet culpam. The same is taught by D. Ambrose in Luke c. 1 there: But as for men, they defile neither those who are conceived nor those to whom God is parent, thus enduring the utmost punishment.

Marked with contamination; therefore, the Holy Doctor [supposes] the danger of abortion. Likewise after the belly is swollen, do not lose the children. Item, 81 in fin. in expos. lit. ibi: Ideò Hieronymus vituperat accessum viri ad uxorem impregnatam, non tamen iidem si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra

triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Semper sit peccatum mortale nisi forte quando probabiliter timetur de periculo abortûs. They, however, consider Sylvester. Ang. et Tab. apud c. n. 1, adesse periculum abortus, si copula habeatur circa initium conceptionis, quia ex novo coitu materia illa nondum plene formata facile dispergitur: nam licet matrix post conceptionem statim claudatur tamen ut ait Avicenna ex vehementi delectatione coitus irritatus aliquando aperitur et materia effunditur.

However, this notwithstanding, Pontius in dict. n. 7 et n. 18 says that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, being odious and strict according to ordinary election, not extraordinary, does not cohere with such danger, for (as they say) this is not considered a mortal sin. But this reason is not approved by me, because when harm is caused to life or the formation of offspring through coitus, then the spouse does not have the right to coitus. It seems rather that it ought to be stated that such a danger is not present, because (as they also say in n. 11). Boss. d. n. 18 Holzmp. 463 cum tali periculorum communiter non adest, dum matrix recepto semine arctissime constringitur, nec ordinarie reservatur per coitum ut tradunt ipse Avicenna et Val- verdus apud Boss. loco citato, cum Conjuges indiscriminatim accedant et tamen abortus non succedant; unde ait Boss., si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria; usque dum constet experientia aliquam uxorem ex coitu pluries foetum emississe, non sit praesumendum periculum abortus. Tanto minus autem aderit tale periculum, si habetur copula tempore proximo partui, ut perperam aliqui dixerunt, putantes tunc exponi prolem discrimini suffocationis; nam verius (ut ait Bosc. n. 30 cum Raynaudo) foetus humanus ita secundinis involvitur, ut eum non possit semine contingere.

From hence he says and therefore that conjugates should not be vexed Im Capitulum Secundum. Dub. II. On Marriage itself. 479 opportunities for questions, so as to abstain during the time of pregnancy: For what hope (says he) will remove them from cohabitation? And what danger is not to be feared if they are disturbed in their good faith? Whether, secluded from danger by means of an abortion, it is a venial fault to have coitus with one who is pregnant?

They affirm that, while the conception is ongoing, his seed frustrates the end for which it was generated. That is confirmed by the authority of

many Saints. Fathers. They however deny it, canon 6, with Gabriel and with Philip 3rd, and with Dic. Turned away, and Diana, because it is per se forbidden nowhere; because it would be a grievous burden, and a matter exposed to countless risks of venial sin, if spouses were kept for so long from the use of conjugal relations, remaining in the same cohabitation.

Responder autem ad rationem oppositam: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Autem ipsa non eveniat, per accidens se habet. However, I find the opinion amusing, which is held by Pont. 1. 10 c. 4 n. 7 and c. 9 n. 36 with Guil. etc., to which they also adhere namely, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For coitus with a pregnant woman cannot be excused from venial fault unless there be danger of incontinence or some other honest cause, according to what is stated in n. 882. Doubt 1, etc., Question None. IV. Is it permissible for husband and wife to cohabit during the time of menstruation?

This should be noted if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. The fluxus of a woman is otherwise termed natural and regular; this one is properly called menorrhagia, since it commonly happens to women each month, and lasts at least two or three days. Un autre extraordinaire, provenant de quelque maladie prolongée, qui parfois dure jusqu'à 12 jours et plus. Time of extraordinary flux is certainly such that to grant as well as to receive is permitted: thus commonly 9 D. 21 n. 7. Pont. 1. 10 c. 14 n. 6. et 13, cum . Th. in 4 D. 3a q. un. art. 2 q. 2 ubi expressè hoc docet, et rationem adducit, dicens: In fluxu menstruum innaturali non est prohibitum ad menstruatum accedere in lege nova, tum propter infirmitatem, quia mulier in tali statu con- cipere non potest; tum quia talis fluxus est perpetuus et diuturnus, unde oportet, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa,

stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Vir perpetuo abstineret.

At temporis autem flussu naturali sunt tria sententiae. The first censure condemns venereal intercourse as mortal sin, and the same [censors] hold that at this time of menstruation, a man willingly intending to commit sin, as well as a woman voluntarily giving herself; but it excuses if the woman render what is due her out of necessity. They uphold the same opinion, Saint Rouche. Alens. Scottus, c. 9 n. 16.

It is proven from 18 where it is said: He who shall have lain with a woman during her menstrual flow: and having uncovered her shame, she herself has opened the fountain of her blood, both of them shall be put to death. They object to this c. n. 2, and if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be accepted as such for ordinary election, not extraordinary, was that law ceremonial, and hence it does not oblige in the Gospel Law. But he responds, D. 2: if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years is to be strictly and odiously interpreted in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; although that law was ceremonial as regards uncleanness, it was nevertheless moral as regards harm. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another three years after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond the three years is to be strictly and odiously interpreted in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; although that precept was ceremonial so far as uncleanness was concerned, it was nevertheless moral with respect to harm (words of S. D.). Because in offspring resulting from such mixing there often followed. Pope: When and without any cause for exception, they who are accustomed to monthly courses are forbidden by their husbands to mix with men. It is proven by three reasons: first, because at that time the offspring exposed to the danger of being born leprous and monstrous; secondly, because there is a danger of semen being wasted, since rarely or never at that time is the Mother apt for conception.

The second sentence, totally opposed to this, states that access to one who is menstruating should be free from any blame; they maintain this in the Glossa in Can. If Caus. v. and Hurt. at that place consider it equally

probable the third, which we shall soon refer to. Reason, because today it is not licensed by any right; not Divine, since with the advent of Chapter II, the Levitical law no longer applies. Dub. II.

On Marriage itself. According to the new law, it has now ceased. They do not say that it is an obstacle if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, because it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; that very prohibition will not have ceased, so far as it was moral to avoid harm to offspring; for they respond if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, because it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. They say that the reason for the prohibition in Leviticus was fear of infection from menstrual blood through coitus; because at that time children were born infected with leprosy and elephantiasis from a woman's menstrual blood. But today there is no uncertain harm present, and it is much more certain that a woman does not conceive at the time of her menstruation. Boss. et . cc. ac demum, etiamsi concipiat cum aliquo damno prolis, dicunt 9 D. 21 n. 7. et id non obstare, quia melius est prolem sic nasci quam non nasci; forte enim postmodum non gigneretur vel non esset eadem proles, unde proles beneficium recipit non damnum; nec obstat dicere si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. et id non obstare, quia melius est prolem sic nasci quam non nasci; forte enim postmodum non gigneretur vel non esset eadem proles, unde proles beneficium recipit non damnum; nec obstat dicere si non proli saltem sic inferatur damnum nature qua postulat ut proles modo convenientiori generetur nam respondunt si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria. et id non obstare, si non inferatur damnum proli neque inferatur naturae. Therefore it is not prohibited by Divine law; but by ecclesiastical law, for Pontius responds to the text of Gregory 1. ro c. 14 n. 6., that this ecclesiastical prohibition has today lost its force; rather the words of the Pontiff 'prohibitantur' are explained by others, as stated there in the Gloss: 'prohibiantur', id est, under the form of prohibition they dissuade.

Neither by natural law, because although it is a common danger at that time to frustrate seed, yet coitus is not required to be honest so that generation may follow therefrom, but it suffices if a Confessor is chosen for the supplement who can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is strictly and odiously understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. If such a Confessor is chosen for the supplement, he may be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is strictly and odiously understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. The coitus itself is apt per se to generation, let seed by chance be dispersed, as happens in approach to a pregnant or sterile woman. Neither do they [assert] in such coitus a culpable indecency to be present, for (as Perez says) that is rather material. Hence they conclude that conjugates do not in any way sin if at that time they cohabit, not now from an affection of lust (if a confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in the election of ordinary, not extraordinary, is received), but according to their own law with moderated delight. The third judgment is commonly and more probable stated, that coitus at the time of menstruation is not mortal, but it cannot be excused as venial; thus St. Anthony, 3 Tom, VI. 3k part., tit. i c. 20 § 3. Pope [or Pontiff] Law 10 Chapter 14 Note 6.

Resp. 3. . with Aversa. . Cornejo, and Soto, Boss: c. 9 n. 22. with Sa, Con. Mire. Reg. D. 21 n. 5. et cum Cajet., quod si quis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria non sit mortale probat ratio adducta mox supra pro secunda sententia. If a confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary; that if a confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. But such venial sin is proved, since such intercourse, when spouses do not wish to expect: a time apt for generation that is already imminent and soon to arrive involves some turpitude and disorderment, because the woman then is unsuited 'for the reception and retention of

seed; therefore intercourse then less conforms to the end of generation. But it is fitting that . . . cc. and with Hurter: if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, he may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary, because no sin would coalesce at such a time if there were some cause that would honorably mask that turpitude, namely, to avoid dissension, or incontinence either in oneself or the other, or similar things.

An autem casu, quo nulla adsit causa, uxor menstruata possit, et teneatur debitum reddere, si maritus monitus nolit desistere? They affirm with Cato and 21 n. 96 with . D. 32, art. 2, q. 3, sed non bene, ut mox videbimus. It is more probable to deny with Pontius chapter 14 note 5 and he who cites Sylv. Reply and Erau.

Reason, because although venial sin holds its part from the act, the spouse is not thereby more probablistically bound; nor can he licitly make reparation: see what is said, no. 946. Neither is it contrary to our opinion that then a wife may be and held liable to repay when greater danger is feared from not repaying. But this is not presupposed in our case. Question NoneV.

Is it illicit to cohabit during the time of purgation after childbirth? It is certain that husbands and wives are not bound to observe today the time of purification prescribed in Leviticus 12, if they are hindered from entering the Temple according to Chapter II. Doubt. II. Concerning Marriage in itself. 485. It seemed to him at that time to be a presumptively interdicted period for conjugal use of 40 days after birth for males, and 80 days for females.

But this precept has already ceased, and today they do not abstain from entering the Church for the ingress thereof, as it is said in c. un. de Purific post part., neither from the use of conjugal relations, as commonly they say; 9 d. 22 num. 8 Missæ, where such is the custom, throughout that entire time, or at least during six weeks, as Sporer and 3 n. 330 verify it to be a common usage. Well. Regarding the sought-after question, there are three opinions present. First stated, it is mortal, and this Butrius and Alexander de Ne yo hold, according to c. D., cap. 22, n. 9. Reason, because at the end of c. c.

Distributio Quinta. D. Gregorius haec expressè vetitum declaravit, dicens: Nisi tempus purgationis priorem transierit, viris suis non debent ad missam iuxta cere. Then, because damage is inflicted upon the offspring, if it is

conceived at that time, as Galen says. Ponteius 1. 10 c. 14 n. 8. The second sentiment is stated, no sin to be; thus with Ang. ac Fill.

Perez, chapter 9 number 42. Because (as they say), this kind of uncleanness is merely material, not moral. The third opinion is more probable and more common, which St. Anthony holds, namely, that it is a venial sin, not however a mortal sin per se. It is venial, because such copulation contains some indecency; whence, unless it be excused by a legitimate cause, namely the danger of incontinence, or of dissension, or some similar reason, it cannot be absolved from every culpability. But it is not mortal sin per se speaking, because such indecency does not seem so grave as to induce a mortal fault.

Regarding the prohibition, however, D. At D. Ant, with Guil, responded that it had been a matter of congruity, not a precept. The reason for the harm of procreation is responded to if someone is chosen as Confessor as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; for this reason, if someone is chosen as Confessor as a supplement, it can be sufficiently confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; thus, it will not come to pass that such a thing happens when it is difficult for a woman to conceive at that time; nor will it come to pass that something grave. It is said intrinsically speaking, for it could at some time be mortal, if a grave illness or notable aggravation of illness were to imminent from coition, as say St. Anthony and with Palud. Sylves: si coitus habeatur statim post partum; nempe eodem die vel sequenti, ut medicus valde peritus mihi asseruit. "From these cases it follows consequently that it is licit to use Marriage."

I. Si coitus habeatur statim post partum; nempe eodem die vel sequenti, ut Medicus valde peritus mihi asseruit. On account of offspring, although this should not necessarily be intended when it is being exercised, still positively it should not be impeded. Nevertheless also in other cases when simply by a licit affection it is excluded, for example from the poor, lest undue burden be imposed upon them. Secondly, with regard to the danger of incontinence in itself, or in part, Mart. Perez d. 40 s. 2 ex etc. contrà: iidem enim fines, quos habere licet ad Matrimonium contrahendum cohoni tanti praesumptum petitionem voluptae.) III.

When health is closed up, or on account of other extrinsic ends: because it is honorable in its own nature and related to one end, it licitly refers to another, which does not repugn to this, as teach Sa, Conin. . 5 t. 1 p. 3 c. 4. March. Perez.d.49 sect 2 n. 4. See Diana, p. 2, t. 4, R. 218. Nevertheless, using it for the cause of health seems probable to be a venial sin, as the saints teach.

Henry. c. against Mart. cc. (V. n. 883. Dub. 2.) Here inquiry is made I. Is there some time when a man is bound to beg? Per se loquendo non tenetur petere; tenetur vero per accidens, nimirum si uxor tacitè exigat; puta si ostendat aliquod indicium, quò tacitam petitionem st- gufficet; quia in mulieribus ob innatam etiam vere- cundiam talia signè habentur pro vera petitione, ità communiter. g D. 2 n. 3 et alii universè ex Cap. II. Dnb.

II. Of Marriage in itself. 435 D. T. 2 ubi: When a man is perceived through certain signs, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict, should be understood in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. If a wife wished to have what was due her restored, but out of modesty kept silent...she is bound to restore it. On the contrary, properly speaking, according to Sanc. num. 5 with Soto and Palao, from the same D., either I feel or I do not feel able to say that it is possible, because a husband cannot constrain his wife so that she ask for her debt with such great bashfulness. But correctly it is excused, as stated by St. Anthony and Manuel, unless such shyness should be presumed at some time (if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly interpreted regarding an ordinary election and not an extraordinary one, which if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the term of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly interpreted regarding an ordinary election and not an extraordinary one. otherwise it rarely happens) as coming from the part of the husband rather than the wife; for example, if she were of greatest authority or of ferocious condition, while the husband were exceedingly timorous and very shy. Nevertheless regularly (and rightly according to Sanchez), a wife is not bound to render, unless it be evident to her that she suffers from this husbandly pusillanimity and pudor.

Question. II. Is a wife bound to seek and petition sometimes? It is certain first, that ordinarily a wife is not bound to petition for such matters,

because this is notably grievous and disgraceful for women. Secondly, it is certain that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementarily, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For when one of either sex is in danger of incontinence, both husband and wife are bound to petition, that the other may be liberated from danger; thus commends Pontius l. 10 c. 2 nu. 3. 9 D. 2 n. 9 with Soto, c. 1 n 17. with Fill. c. et Henr.

Diana, et P. Soto, dict, teneri ex justitia. Reason, because, since husbands and wives are bound to preserve the good of faith, when one is in danger of incontinence, then let the other not ask for relief, but rather necessity itself should call for it so that the good of faith may be preserved by avoiding the other's incontinence; therefore, then it is more appropriate to render than to demand a debt. It is confirmed by an example, for if a physician is bound by contract to heal the sick, he is bound by justice to provide him with the medicine, even though he does not request it. And this opinion seems to adhere to D. Thom. 3 ad 2 where it is said: If someone intends through an act of Marriage to commit fornication in the Conjugate, there is no sin, because this is what is done by rendering a debt due, which pertains to the good of faith. The second opinion, which seems more probable, and which those hold who have stated in 2 n 7 with note 22, is that one must be held [bound] only by charity.

Reason, because where there is neither an expressed nor a tacit request from the other spouse, there is no obligation of justice to give what is due. But for the good of matrimony faith some regard is paid that the wife may not commit adultery, rather than to prevent another from committing it; for although this pertains in a certain way to the good of faith, yet it does not pertain so strictly as to oblige justly by petitioning. Therefore, according to D. Thomas, such a petition is not said to be an absolute rendering, but rather a rendering of debt; and thus the Holy Doctor addsuced this only to excuse the petitioner: if he petitions to avoid incontinence in another, not however that he may be bound thereby to petition. Neither is hindered the example of the physician: for the physician is indeed bound to provide medicine to the sick man, not demanding it, because he has obligated himself by contract to attend to him; but the husband obligated himself not to break faith, not however to prevent another from breaking faith. From this sentence it is inferred that if a Confessor should be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition regarding the non-choice of a Confessor beyond a three-year period, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted, pertains to

ordinary election rather than extraordinary. The wife is not bound by justice to petition in that case, but only by charity; hence she is not bound to petition when it would entail great difficulty; from this it follows probably that the wife is excused from petitioning if she should have to endure great shame. Question None

III. Whether a conjugal person, who is forbidden to petition on account of a vow, or affinity, or spiritual relationship contracted after Marriage, can sometimes lawfully exact a debt? This is commonly admitted by the Doctors, with [a reference to] Decretum, lib. 3, cap. 7, n. 5. (who cites this.) If there is a danger of incontinence in the other spouse: Nay rather, they say, n. 261 and the same for Sot., etc., then it should be held that one ought to ask for what is owed, because this obligation arises from the very institution of marriage. The same is admitted in the presumed Chapter II. Doubt.

Two. According to Martinuonium itself. Commonly, in St. Thomas Aquinas's third part [of the Summa Theologiae], question one, article three, question two, ad four. D. 8 nu. 1 with St. Thomas, Sylvestrum. Ang. Towercr.

Henry says: It is modest, and the man feels its will regarding the rendition of debts. Then the conjugal partner who is hindered can offer himself, because then it is more proper to render than to petition. How often, however, is it permissible for him to offer himself? It must be said that this is permitted four times in a month; but rather more appropriately when victorious, they say that this should depend on circumstances, namely on greater or lesser inclination towards fear in the other party. They deem that n. 2 and the Anglicans prohibit a married person bound by vow from offering himself to coitus when the wife grants him permission to vow chastity; because then it is considered as having itself been abrogated according to its own right, namely, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, is not so in extraordinary cases; that, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, is not so in extraordinary cases. For the husband should petition according to his debt owed; unless (they except) that the wife be in danger of incontinence, whereupon they say that it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor

beyond three years, being odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, is not so in extraordinary cases. For he who vows should be bound to petition out of the obligation arising, and as has been said above, from the very institution of Marriage. An autem liceat petere Conjugi impeditio, si ipse sit in periculo incontinentiae?

Affirmant Viguerius, et Quintanad. apud 7 cum Guttier et Cov. But the first opinion with regard to the impediment imposed by the Church appears to me not disapproved, if indeed a dispensation cannot be obtained quickly and a great danger lies in delay; this is further confirmed by the question sequent. Question. IV. May a married man who has been excommunicated pay his debt to one who is excommunicated? And may he petition an excommunicated person?

If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Therefore, if a confessor is chosen for the sake of supplementation, it can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary election rather than extraordinary. It follows that conjugal debt may be demanded from the excommunicated one, which is certain from c. Quoniam multos VII. expressè id concedit. Whether, however, it is licit for the one excommunicated to presume and petition? The wives deny it, and it is quite evident that they openly consent according to the Archdiocese, as stated in 9 D. 14 n. 19, because in the Bull of Martin V. To avoid excommunication, if for the supplement a confessor is chosen, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood with reference to ordinary elections rather than extraordinary ones. This prohibition concerning communication with the faithful does not concede any privilege. But they commonly and truly affirm.

D. 15 sess. 4 n. 9. Good. Same title, chapter 2, Decretum, page 6, section 2, note 20, and Bossuet, originale, note 282 oum Palud. Bor-don. etc. Reason, because the Ecclesiastical Law does not oblige to such a peril in which it would indeed be publicly proclaimed that it could not itself separate from the other spouse (as it cannot truly do so), and one could not petition for separation. 3a: Quaesiris, an, et quando liceant tacti, aspectui, et verba turpia inter conjuges? » Resp.

Such acts are permitted per se to them; because if it is permissible for a person to have an end, it is also permissible for him to undertake means, and if it is permissible for him to reach a summary conclusion, it is also permissible for him to initiate a presumptuous beginning? Whereby such things lawfully excite nature to copulation. If a confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received for ordinary election, not for extraordinary one; and if separated and without order concerning copulation, that is, for the sake of voluptuousness only, they are venial sins. But if a confessor be chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received for ordinary election, not for extraordinary one; this being so on account of the status which gives right to those acts: unless, as frequently he continues, they are joined with danger of pollution or have spouses under a vow of chastity, for then they become mortal sins, as stated above in I. 3 t. 4 c. 2 d. 4. ## Unde resolves. g33 1. Conjax commits a venial sin only. By touching himself out of pleasure, by reference to touch not thus clearly brought back to copulation, as probatively teaches against Vasquez and others . g' d. 44. 2.

By delighting itself in venery without danger of pollution from a conjugal act, it cogitates while the occasion is absent, and the act cannot be performed. Fill. Res. 224 contra Navar. Azor, etc. Chapter II. Dub.

Two. On Marriage itself. 48g 2. He gravely sins, 1. A widow, who delights in venery from the act of copulation once performed: because it is illicit for her by reason of her state. 2. Bigamus, qui in actu conjugali cum secunda exercet hostem, repræsentat sibi priori, et de ea carnaliter delectatur, quia est permixtio cum aliena. 1 t. 9 c. 6 vide supra 1. 3 t. 4 c. 2 et 1. 5 c. 1 d. 2 a. 2 *(Et idem diximus 1. 5 n. 24 de sponsis, quibus illicitum est delectari de futura, praesumptum ex appetitu rationali, etsi non carnali.) * Question None

Illicita est illi per statum quia se venere oblectat de copula olim habita. Whether touching and looking that are base and vile between husband and wife on account of mere pleasure, without order toward union, are mortal sins unless there be danger of pollution? They affirm St. Anthony. Sylvius 1. 9. D. 44 a. 11. quia (ut dicunt) omnis actus venereus, non relatus ad copulam conjugalem, est mortalis.

But the common and more certain opinion holds this; cf. Sentences 3, 4,

note 12; Commentary on Peter Lombard's Sentences, 4, note 125. Sporer n. 502. 44 n. 12 cum Arm. Sa, Medievalist commentary on chapter fifteen, note eighty-four with Henry. Aversa, Perez, et Diana. et et pluribus aliis. Reason, because the conjugal status befits and decorates intercourse; hence such a presumption is made concerning this kind of touch and appearance; otherwise, since there is such great companionship among spouses, they would often find themselves in perilous straits if such acts were gravely illicit for them.

However, a delectation sought congruously in copulation does not exceed venial fault in this regard; thus presumptuously in these touches and aspects. And this even if the union itself was then forbidden on account of a disease, or impossible on account of impotence which had supervened, as they say in 199 cum Con. Fag. Avers. Fill.

Accordingly, however, one must say that if the spouse were bound by a vow of chastity, because such a vow excludes all venereal pleasure voluntarily sought; thus commonly. D. 44 n. 26 and C. and others: 4th Book. VI. Treatise. VI.

On Marriage. Now if the husband be hindered from cohabitation by a spiritual affinity or relationship contracted, shall this proceed? The Adverse party affirms there, but Bossius denies it there with Fag. Moreover in practice he who is impeded should regularly abstain from such touches, especially those that are disgraceful, on account of the danger of pollution or of being led to the act of copulation, contrary to the prohibition by petitioning. §34. Inquire.

II. What if spouses, foreseeing pollution to ensue from these vile acts, act with caution? There are more opinions. The first opinion, which is held . 9 D. 45 ex n. 34 Fill. tr. 3 c. 9 n. 356. . 7 art. 4 n. 4 Escob. l. 26 n. 207 . 393. cum Herinex et Spor n. 500. cum Perez, et Gob. excuses ab omni culpa praesumpta in potente, si non intenditur pollutionem, nec adsit periculum consensus in eam; et modò tactus non sit adeò turpis, ut judicetur inchoata pollutionem (proût esset digitum morosè admovere intrà vas, fœmineum); ac præterea adsit aliqua gravis causa talem tactum adbibendi, nempe ad se præparandum ad copulam, vel ad fovendum mutuum amorem. Reason, because then that just cause sanctions such acts, which otherwise are not illicit between Conjuges; and if pollution occurs, this will be by accident.

It is said that if a grave cause exists; for if such a cause does not exist, the aforementioned acts are not excused by a mortal sin. Second opinion. Which is held in c. 7 n. 213 and Hurt. They assert that it is turned aside and common to distinguish, and to declare a touch as mortal sin if

impurity be feared to result therefrom; because, since these proximately conduce to impurity, and are not instituted by themselves for fostering conjugal affection, they are deemed voluntary in the cause; but if they be chaste, like kisses and embraces, because acts of such kind between spouses are per se licit, as being apt per se to foster conjugal love. Chapter Two. Dub.

II. On Marriage in itself. • 491 according to the opinion of Diana, as stated on page 6, chapter 7, section R, paragraph 65, following the Propositions and Definitions, it is mortal both for those who are shameless and for those who are chaste, if the danger of pollution be incurred. Reason, because accordingly touch is permitted among spouses insofar as they seek to remain within the limits of marriage, insofar as nothing follows that repels from the end and institution of generation: but since the dispersion of generation is foreseen, even if it is not intended, any kind of touch becomes illicit. His sententiis positis. Puto probabilius dicendum, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Tactus turpes inter Conjuges cum periculo pollutionis, tam in petente quàm in reddemte sint mortalia: nisi habeantur ut Conjuges se excitent ad co-pulam proximè secuturam, quia cum ipsi ad copulam jus habeant, habent etiam jus ad tales actus, tametsi pollutio per accidens copulam præveniat. However, chaste touches are also mortal sins, if they be made with danger of pollution either in oneself or in another, when such things are done solely for pleasure, or even for a slight reason; but if on account of a grave cause, as when there is an urgent reason to show signs of affection in order to foster mutual love, or so that the spouse may deflect suspicion from another; if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be confirmed well by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be confirmed well by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood odiously and strictly regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; thus himself may be inclined towards another person.

Probabiliter dicunt. D. 45 n. 34. Boss. d. n. 203 et in reddente tactus etiam impudicos, nisi sint tales ut videantur inchoata pollutio, esse licitos quamvis sit periculum pollutionis in alterutro; quia tunc reddens dat opera rei licitae ad quam obligatur propter jus petentis qui tametsi peccet non tamen jus amittit cum culpa se tenet ex parte personae juxta dicenda ex n.

944. Whether, however, it is always a mortal sin if a man introducetht hecdiud into the mouth of his wife? They deny. 9 D. 17 n. 5 et cum Fill. ac Perez, provided that the danger of pollution is otherwise absent.

But they more truly affirm Spoerer in lib. 7 c. 3 § 5 n. 33 and Diana p. 6 tract. 7 R. 7. with Llb. VI. Tract. VI. On Marriage. nation); For it is always sought from the man another vessel besides the vessel, that which has been naturally instituted for copulation seems to be a new species of luxury.

However, Sporer I. c. accepts it: since indeed this opinion seems to be rightly held even now. It likewise objects if a man were to do this in order to excite himself for natural copulation; But neither of the aforementioned is, I think, permissible. In the same manner, c. n. 32. at the end [damns] the man from mortal sin who should place a digit improperly in his wife's sexual organ during the act of copulation, because (as it is said) in this act there is an affection tending toward sodomy. But I hold that it can indeed be found such an effect in the act, yet speaking per se I do not know this effect inherent in such an act. I say that conjugates who always deserve severe rebuke are those practicing such a foul act.

Seek. III. Are those mortal sins touched by turpitude, whom he has joined with himself in concupiscence, absent another, and secluded from a peril of pollution? The first opinion denies what are held at chapter 9. D. 44 n. 15 with Palud. and Lopez; and for this opinion see T. q. 6 de Bon.

Matr. dub. 26 n. 188. Reason: because such touches are countenanced by the very state of matrimony, since they are ordered according to their nature for union; and therefore, secluded from the danger of pollution, they cannot be grievously illicit in the conjugal relationship, although at present he himself would not be able to consummate the union. The second opinion, however, is more probable, and altogether commendable in practice; and this they maintain: 3 c. 6 n. 12 at the end, Diana p. 3 tr. 4. R. 215 (since this Author is exceedingly benign), and Vasquez ac; whence when there is no possibility of coition, embraces with oneself are altogether illicit; namely because Cap. II. Dub.

II. On Marriage itself. 49 touches on the shamefulness of lusts, 'when they are indulged hastily,' and with the agitation of spirits, by their very nature tend toward pollution; and they are closely connected to that danger. Question. IV. Whether a morose delight in connection with or intended for copulation, which nevertheless cannot be had at present, is a mortal delight, Con- g3, judge of the bond held or to be held?

To are three opinions. The first opinion affirms, and this is held by Pope 1. 10 c. 16 n. 21. Wigandt translated 4 n. 59. Sylv. ac Vega, c. 15 n. 88, qui probabilem vocant. Reason, because such delight is as it were a commencing pollution, which, since at that time it cannot be possessed with due measure, becomes altogether illicit.

The second opinion, however, more common, denies it and holds that, 8 n. 12. Spore, n. 505. Croix n. 337 cum Spor et Perez, et . 9. D. 44 n. 3 cum S. Augustine. Palud. c. 15 n. 89, quorum habent presumptum probabilem.

This opinion is licit, that such delectation is not mortal, if there be no danger of pollution, but only venial. It is venial, because it lacks a due end, since it cannot be ordered to present copulation. Non est autem mortalis, quia delectatio sumit suam bonitatem vel malitięm ab objecto; et cum copula sit lícita Conjugatibus, non potest esse illi graviter illicita illius delectationis. And this is especially favored if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, who may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious, strict, and binding in ordinary election, not in extraordinary one. Thus says D. 2, ad 17 ubi: A carnal mixture that occurs at the wrong time is not a mortal sin for those married; it cannot be a graver sin to consent in delight than to consent in act. Idque admittit.

Tertia demùm sententia, quam tenent c. 15 n. 90, distinguere et dict: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Ac si delectatio sit absque commotione spiritum, non erit mortalis; ac si cum commotione et titillatione partium. I will pronounce my judgment. If a delight is to be considered not merely with commotion of spirits, but also presumptuously with titillation or venereal pleasure, I feel it according to the 494th Lib. Sixth. Treatise.

VI: On Marriage. However, I think it should be stated thus: If that voluptuous titillation is absent, then there is no proximate danger of pollution for the delectation; even if there is a disturbance of the spirits; and so truly does he feel at chapter 4 with Vasquez, where he does not excuse the delectation with venereal pleasure, but only (as he says) with

the disturbance and alteration of parts without the danger of pollution. Because such a commotion is closely akin to that voluptuous titillation, therefore conjugal partners are especially bound in horror to abstain from this delectation of protraction: Moreover, it should be noted that it would altogether be illicit for a husband who has been obstructed by a vow of chastity, as commonly they say. D. 44 n. 26 et et aliis. ARTICULUS II.

An actus conjugalis sit praeceptus et debitus. Conjuges per se tenentur reddere et quanloque eam petere. Tenentur praesumptum ad cohabitationem nisi adsit justa causa excusans. Dub. 1. Can a man expel his wife on account of dower that has not been discharged? Dub. 2. Is she bound to maintain her, when the dowry is not dissolved?

Dub. 3. If she herself has committed adultery? Regarding the obligation of repaying a debt. Question I. Is it mortal to deny a debt once, or twice? What if another one remits it, or what if he yields to prayers?

What if he petition violently? What if another delays, and wishes to return within a brief time? 941 Q. II. Can the multiplicity of children be a just reason for denying a debt? 942 The Conjugal Partner who confesses himself impotent. 943 Qu. I. Is a husband bound to give to one who unlawfully demands? 944 Doubt 1.

What if fault lies on the part of the petitioner himself, namely, if he has a vow of chastity, etc.? 945 Dub. 2. What if the petitioner is an incestuous person? 946 Qu. II. Is the conjugal partner bound to give to the petitioner with culpable intent alone? III.

Is it permissible to repay or request from a man who wishes to threaten himself outside after the act has been initiated? Chap. II. Dub. Two. Concerning Marriage in itself. 495 948 Whether the wife is bound to be able to render it, if they have mutually vowed chastity with another? What if the husband is insane or intoxicated? 949 An incestuous person, and he who has vowed chastity cannot petition but is bound to render it. 950 The wife is not bound to render it when there is a serious injury to herself or her offspring.

Is one bound to render to another who is laboring under a contagious disease? What if the damage is slight, and the other party beleprous? What if the damage is serious? Then can he be required to make restitution? On the grounds of which causes can a wife be released from her obligations with grave danger to salvation? 951 Can a wife be released from her obligations with danger to offspring? 952 Is it binding upon her to fulfill

her duties if she is laboring with fever, or temporarily with menstruation, or during pregnancy, or if another man requests intercourse in an unnatural manner? 953 What if the wife has experienced danger of death in childbirth, or given birth to dead children? 954 Is it ever permissible to impede generation?

When the wife, after arising, immediately experiences pain? Dub. 1. Can a girl who is oppressed immediately expel the seed? Dub. 2. May it be permitted to copulate with old men or infirm ones, who very often are unable to seed within the vessel?

Resp. I. Even though husband and wife are not bound by any law to the use of marriage according to 938, nevertheless they are held by justice themselves to render that which is due to them, if one from the other expressly or tacitly requests it, notwithstanding modesty preventing such request. The reason for the prior matter is because one is not bound to use its own right. The reason for the latter follows from the nature of a mutual contract. S. Th.

In the fourth book, thirty-second question, first article, number two, etc., commonly according to one. Conclusion 7. Wherefore it is resolved. 1. A neuter is held, speaking per se, to petition for a debt due, even though it may be held per accidens sometimes, for example, out of charity, such as in averting an imminent danger to the conjugal continence: See.

Perez. d. 50 s. 2. n. 4 et 5. *(Vide dicta n. 928 et 929) vel ex justitia legali, eò si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. salus publica periclitetur, nisi proles nascatur. ' 2. Husbands are bound to cohabit, nor can one be from the other for an extended period without necessity; because this obligation follows from the obligation 496 Lib. VI. Treatise.

VI. On Marriage. • of rendering a debt. g d. 4. Conin. d. 2 n. » 19. Perez d. 50 n. 3. It is certain that spouses are bound by an obligation of justice to cohabit in the same house, at table, and in the marriage bed; see g.

D. 4 n. 2 et Hinc infert, necunum conjugis potest alio discedere, altero invito, ad longum tempus, ut habetur ex c. 1 de Conj. lepros. Unless there be just causes, namely for the public good, or to maintain or succor one's family, or to avoid harm from enemies, as stated in nos. 4 and 6 with Aversa, he says that a husband may undertake a brief pilgrimage for

devotion's sake without the wife's consent; however, this cannot be done by the wife without the husband's consent, since she is subject to his will, and it does not become of women to wander from home; thus, see nos. 3 and Bossuet ad ann. 8 with . Fag. et Perez ex cap. 5 et Boss. a. 18 cum Fil. et aliis ex illo Apostoli.(1. Cor. 7.): Nolite fraudare invicem, nisi forte consentiatis ad tempus ut vacetis orationi; et iterum revertimini in idipsum, ne tentet vos Satanas. Doubt. 1.

It is permitted to a man not to cohabit with his wife, for she has been expelled from the house because of the promised dowry and not dissolved? Pasoravit affirms: because a man is not bound to nourish his wife, if the dowry has not been discharged; therefore neither is he bound to cohabit with her, since it is bounden to render that which is due. But they deny more probable and common. g. D. 5 n. 37. § 8i marito, Henr. Reg. . etc. Ratio, quia obligatio cohabandi non exit ur ex solum Cap. II.

Dub. II. On Marriage according to itself. 69 mention of dower, but from the natural and divine law themselves by which a man is bound to render debt to his wife, and therefore to live with her; hence, say the aforementioned authors (contra Molinists and Reformed), if any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious, strict, and applicable to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Even though the man has not yet brought his wife into his own home, he is bound to do so; notwithstanding, if any Confessor be chosen for supplementation, it may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be understood as odious, strict, and applicable to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Even if the debt has not been discharged. But here the doubt arises: whether a man is bound to maintain his wife, even if the dowry has not been fully discharged? Commonly they deny, if the fault of the promisor intervenes: thus. g.

D. 5 n. 8. c. 6 n. 29 et . et . Regarding burdens concerning the legal dowry where it is said: therefore the dowry was constituted so that from it the husband may maintain his wife. Receive nevertheless. Unless the man has taken her without a promise of dowry, c. with an abbot. If the wife is in subjection to her husband's service, then indeed she is bound to him as a servant and must provide for her sustenance; yet note that this does not admit of exception when there is deafness or similar conditions, because (as he says) the wife is obligated both to provide dower and to render service to the husband; hence it is not necessarily incumbent upon her to

be maintained, provided she renders service.

But I adhere more closely to the opposed opinion, because the very law of Nature prescribes that you provide for her whom you occupy with household duties as if she were your servant. Receive the third: if a wife by her own fault does not cohabit with her husband; otherwise if for just cause; Psalm n. 51. because this is allowed. Moreover, when either the husband or wife is truly poor—suppose that by fortuitous circumstance the dower has perished; each is bound to assist the other; if the husband dies, the widow is sustained. Upon dissolution of Matrimony, thereupon, What indeed is human then, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary; which, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict to be understood regarding ordinary election, but not extraordinary. fortuitous cases, either the wife's husband, or the husband's wife participating therein? This however must be noted: si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. For, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. On account of the dowry not having been dissolved, he cannot refuse a debt to his wife; C. n. 1 et Th. 2. 2 q. 26 art. 11 et n. 5 t contra etc. apud Et prius praesumptum aliis, cum ipsi sint pars Parentis; VI. 49 Lib.

VI. Tract. VI. On Marriage. to others. In necessitate vero gaude priùs concedendum est conjugi quàm parentibus et filiis, quia quoad domesticam administrationem connexitio inter conjuges cumipsisìt una caro.

D. 29 n. 4. ibid. cum et aliis. Question 3. whether a man is bound to provide aliments for his adulterous wife? Others affirm, as Clarus says, 'and Ant. Gabr. apud . Others, as Sylv. says.

Dos question 14. Disting. 9 t Ang. ac Surdus apud Begant; si adulterium est publicum, quia tunc potest vir uxorem ex domo expellere; s'ecùs'si

occultum, tum enim expellere nequit Alii verò communius et probabilius ut 1. D. 8 n. 25 and Mansuetudinem. Beg. et . Reason, because up to now if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; which, if a Confessor is chosen for the purpose of supplementation, can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Because on account of hidden adultery the wife could not be expelled lest her crime be revealed, and that scandal be avoided (though there is question about this; see remarks n. 968); quite otherwise this reason does not apply in negating aliments; which can be denied without scandal and infamy to the wife.

They say this to be probable; either if they are notorious; or if they are secret, and excessively lascivious, or if the wife is very noble. « 3. It is a mortal sin to him who, seriously and insistently petitioning his wife, denies her debt, because it is a serious matter and is owed by justice; unless the petitioner can be diverted otherwise than by bribery or some other honest reason, and the request not be immoderate (for if he is denied even for frequently and repeatedly seeking, per chance there seems to be only venial sin on account of the lightness of the matter: and sometimes, if most immoderately and justly sought many times, no other just cause should be lacking for denying). He fills (or completes). But the just one, sequestered from danger by incontinence: both kinds, he considers to be M. Perez l.c. n. 6 si plures nascantur filii quam possint alere: Cap. II. Dub.

II. On Marriage itself. 49g Question. I. Whether the husband who denies his debt gravely sins either once or twice? The first opinion denies it, provided that there be no danger of pollution; and this is held by Pope Leo in book 10, chapter 2, note 5, together with St. Thomas, in Decretals 9, chapter 2, note 11, according to what is found at page 4, section 1, note 5; and at 7, chapter 3, section 5, number 20: namely, that it is presumptuously taken not to grant or defer a debt seriously and promptly requested once or twice. Speaking strictly, it is held to be mortal still with the danger of pollution removed.

Reason, because this seems to be matter sufficiently grave, both on account of a child, which can be begotten by a single copulation; and also on account of discord, and of the danger of incontinence, which can result from such a denial. His tamen non obstantibus, prima sententia non videtur improbabilis, cum gravitas materiae pendeat ab hominum

aestimatione, et tot graves DD. censeant hanc esse materiam levem; ipsimet autem id dicunt, supponendo quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Absit periculum incontinentiae vel magni dissidii; caeterum procreatio prolis pro illa vice est valde incerta. They generally agree, that one does not commit sin by negating one's wife, if the husband requests it either benevolently or remissly; thus, Pontificium at loco citato n. 4 et 5. Bon. d. n. 1. Croix n. 30i.

Reply 1. and Ochagüe c. 1 n. 35 with Soto. Resp. Hæret. ; alia siquidem etiam veniale modo peccaret; ita . D. 2 n. 13 cum . Margar. that another might appear as though coerced into yielding; Or rather unless there were a danger of incontinence present in the other; for then even without serious cause it would not be permissible to turn him aside; thus Sanch l.c. says. Lop.

D: Th. in IV. D 32 q. 1 a. 2 ad 4. Besides this, one does not sin by negating, when another immoderately petitions, yet without risk of incontinence; and on this point all agree, see Hinc dicunt Laym c. i n. i. Cross n. 396. Holzrn. n: 468. cum non esse mortale post tertiam copulam in eadem nocte habitam negare quartam Imo addunt c. et nec esse mortale petenti quinquies in mense negare semel; sed huic non acquiesco, cum ex una parte petere quinquies in mense sit valde moderatum, et ex altera negare semel in mense videatur materia sat gravis.

Item, non videtur peccare uxor, si differat reddere ad breve tempus, nempe usque ad noctem; ut Sancius dicit numerum ii cum c., et num. 37 cum Non potest autem, post copulam habitam in die, negare in nocte. 51 Quæritur. II. Whether there is a just cause for denying a debt if more children are born than the spouses can nourish? The first opinion denies this, and adhere to this view: 16 c. i n. 16. R. I. (qui excipit solum casum, quo conjuges multiplicata prole ad extremam necessitatem redigerentur) item con. Reb.

Reason, because provision for offspring pertains to the principal end of Marriage, to which any inconvenience should be postponed; it is better that the offspring live than that there be none at all; furthermore, because either the Spouse would deny long, or sometime: if long, he would expose the other to danger of incontinence; if sometime, he would falsely deny; for spouses conceive more easily and readily when they cohabit less frequently. The second opinion asserts, and they hold this: 9. D. 25 n. 3. Pontificalis libri X capitulum III nota VII. VII. R. 3. e. i n. 220 cum et

probabilem putant 7 c. 3 § 5 n. 3 et c. Ratio tum quia multiplicitas prolis futurae cederet in nocumentum filiorum Cap. II.

Doubt. II. Of Marriage according to itself. I am a son both because in all debts great difficulty excuses from solution. However, all agree that there is an obligation to provide if there is a danger of incontinence on the part of the other: and if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition concerning not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict it is regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, truly (as Conin. rightly observes) scarcely applies if in the same case the husband resides there and the other demands his debt; and thus the first proposition more readily comes to my mind. « 4.

A grave sin committeth the man or woman who se impotentˆa tem reddat praesumptum, mediis aliàs licitis, v. g. jejunis, etc. invita comparte: 'imò si alter non possit reddere debitum, licite non observat jejunia Eccle-sia (Vide dicta l. 3 n. 1034. v. 3 Excusandum; ubi diximus id procedere de viro; nam uxorem difficile videtur per jejunia fieri impotentem ad reddendum, ut .) '; congruent et uxor, si notabiliter iis fiat deformior. Bon. l.c.g.d. 3 n. 11 n. 306 etc Perea d. 50 s. 2. 5. A husband is bound to render a debt, although it be lawfully asked of him, if this repayment is neither demanded nor required at present, e.g., for the sake of the petitioner's pleasure, or because of a marital vow, or on a feast day, etc. V. . g. d. 6. » Pontifical law, chapter three.

Con. d. 34. d. 6. Perea d. 50 s. '5. Because malice of another does not give him the right to deny, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in ordination elections, is not so in extraordinary elections; which, if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, as odious and strict in ordinations for ordinary, not extraordinary elections. » suum est. Nevertheless, it is not binding to give what is requested unless there be a grave cause, or something innately unnatural, or in an improper public or sacred place, etc. It is certain that a husband is not bound to repay a debt with his own sin, and still less with a venial sin, because no one can be obligated to commit sin; thus commonly 17. and elsewhere similarly.

But seek. I. Sed Question NoneWhether it is licit to give illicitly to one who has a mortal sin? If sin holds on account of the act itself, as when another

person seeks confession in a sacred or public place, or with risk to abortion, whether one's own health or that of another, where all convene, and marriage is not to be observed nor can it be given without grave sin; then, since the act is per se evil and an unjust request has been made, even if someone were chosen as a confessor for supplementation, it might well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be rigorously accepted for ordinary election, but not for extraordinary one, does not deprive him of the right to seek, so that... gc. 6 d. 16 n. 8. 502 Lib. VI.

Treatise. Sixth. On Marriage. Pont. 1. 10 c. 3 n. 3. with D. and others frequently. But Dubit. 1.

Si culpam habet ex parte personae exigentis, scilicet si ille ait quod impediat votum castitatis vel petat propter malum finem, potestne alius reddere? The first common sentence is stated thus: not only can it be held, but also it is presumptuously held; and from this follows. Doctor. XV. Sectio quarta. Num. nonus. Lugo concerning the Sacraments. Decretum 8 number 182.

Continue. Resp. 1. 5 tr. 10 p. 3 c. 1 n. 17. Goodly question, fourth part, page three note three. Page four section eleven note three. V. Third; 416. Escobar, lib. 25, n. 91, cum Sylvio.

Con. Coen. et Heinr. . D. 6 num. 7. cum Ang. Manual. P. Soto, c. 1 n. 241. cum Perez, Diana, Fill. et cum Avers. Reason, because that husband did not lose the right to petition through his vow; hence, although it is illicit, nevertheless it does not demand an unjust debt.

The second opinion, which the Pontifical authors hold in Book 10, Chapter 3, note 3., and Croix in Book 6, page 3, note 353., with Sylv. Commentators and a few others say that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Whether the guilt arises from the act itself or from the fact that the one seeking has been implicated, he should not be allowed (unless he can free himself from that adverse circumstance by the power of the seeker, for example, if he were demanding it for an evil purpose). Reason: because, given the impediment of a vow, the conjugal act necessarily is illicit for the petitioner, with whom another cannot cooperate. Neither then does the petitioner have dominion over another's body in that case, firstly because dominion at that

time is an impediment to a vow; secondly because the spouse has no right except for the licit use of Matrimony. These, however, agree with what is said in Rescript. no. 697 where Lugo de Just says. D. 21 n. 62. et Croix, cum hoc dicunt.

Soto, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. debitor non teneatur restituere Domino rem, qua ille est abusurus ad peccandum; si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. expresse praesumptum tradidit 2 q. 62 art. 5 ad. 1 ubi: Quando res restituenda apparet esse graviter nociva ei, cui restitutio fucienda est, non ei debet tunc restitui, quia restitutio ordinatur ad utilitatem ejus cui restituitur. Dict tamen Lugo l. c. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria., cum haec obligatio sit tantum charitatis, non oblige- Cap. H. Doubt. II. On marriage, it is scuadum se; 565 thus the debtor is bound to deny, if he cannot deny without great inconvenience.

This opinion is indeed probable, but the former seems more probable at first glance; for a serious reason mitigates the case, inasmuch as one who has his request frustrated still retains the right to demand, and consequently he is bound to repay the other party accordingly, just as if someone had not issued the order not to demand the debt owed, but only to commit a material sin by failing to repay when demanded; and thus you would not formally cooperate in his sin, since you are not the cause why he demands repayment, but merely concur in a material sin. If a Confessor is chosen as an addition, this can be well confirmed through another three years after the supplement period, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, should be understood with regard to ordinary rather than extraordinary elections; therefore you cannot impede repayment since you must render to your master what belongs to him; hence neither can you hinder, lest by hindering you commit an act of injustice. Neither does it hinder to say that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, his confirmation might well be

valid through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For no one has a right to an illicit act; it was answered that if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, his confirmation might well be valid through another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is odious and strictly to be received concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. Let that husband who petitioneth thus be without right to petition with sin, yet he hath a right to the conjugal act which in itself is honest, wherefore the other doth not sin by returning it, because he renders aid not to another's sin but to an lawful act, according to justice due. From hence they say: G. D. 36 n. 11. with Palud. and with Imò etymically; even if they have mutually vowed, not intending to yield their right, yet he is bound to give to the petitioner what is asked, as they also say in idem c. with Benè, but nevertheless they advert: G. D. 6 n. 5. with c. 1 n. 248. with Con. Reb. et, quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Eo casu teneatur conjux monere petentem ligatum votis, ut ab petitione desistat; modo posit monere sine timore magni dissidii, vel indignationis, aut incontinentiae alterius: quae incommoda dicunt Sanchez., et Bossius, ut plurimum adesse. When however the spouse foresees, if a confessor be chosen for supplementation, it can be properly confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, being odious and strict, is to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if anyone be chosen as confessor for supplementation, it may be properly confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition regarding non-choosing a confessor beyond three years, because odious and strict, is to be understood in reference to ordinary election, not extraordinary. Moreover, if there be some impediment or other illicit obstacle petitioned, then it will belong to him who foresees that he prevent it himself; and if the other has already been rejected, then he himself will 504 Lib VI.

Treatise. VI. On Marriage. Then let it be presumptuously begged, saying: I wish that you give to me; But with justice he says: n. 5. Wives are rarely obligated, because a great burden would be for them to always petition out of natural modesty. Moreover, it is to be noted that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can properly be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and

strict, should be understood for regular election, not extraordinary; thus, if the spouse is hindered from petitioning within the first two months, he should not be bound nor can another person substitute for him at that time since he will then no longer have the right to petition. 945 Dubit. 2. An conjux possit et teneat ur damine cedui de pe petenti incestuosus?

There are contrary opinions from Aliut Hostiensis and Lopez according to Bossuet. c. i n. 2 4 9 dicunt teneri. Aliuut Pontius 1. 10 c. 3 n. 3 ' et Palac. ac P. 1. 9 D 6 n. 1 1. dicitur nec tenerti, nec posse, qui ac si incestuosus sussit privatus juris penendi, illius peccati cooperaretur illicite, cito cooperaretur illius pecati. Aliiverocommunius, etprobabiliusdicuntnonteneri, sedposse; ita. 1 2. . 4 § 6 n. 7 - Bon. q. 4 p. 3 num. 3. . 1 5 n. 1 5. Bonaventura, c. i n. 250. cum S. Anthony.

Marsh. Sylv. . Vict. Reg. Ratio, quialicetincestuosussitpri- vatusjuresuo, Conjuxtameninocens, cumhabeatjuspetenti, afortiorihabetjusreddendi, alioquigraveonusdeberetsubire (maximeuxor), sisemperdeberetpetere; imomagisscrupulis. deberetangiri, existimans, nefortemoveaturadreddendumextacitapetitionealterius; hocautemonussatisexcusatacooperationeadmaterialepeccati, quodcommititin- cestuosus. More safely or more deservedly (as we have said), so that his innocent spouse may petition. Question NoneII.

To one petitioning with only a venial fault, should another be made to render? Others affirm as Escob. 1. 25 n. 93. Sporer n. 518. . 9 D. 6 n. 6. et D. 16 n. 8. cum Cajetano et Petrus Soto; cum Doctor. Soto, et Cap. II. Dub.

Second. On Marriage itself. 305. (as it is said. However, others (as with Armilla), say that it is not to be observed unless there be a just cause from the part of the petitioner. I say absolutely that the act is illicit from the standpoint of the petitioner's person: for instance, if he petition out of desire for pleasure or some other slight evil end; or on a day chosen by himself to receive the Eucharist, then he is bound to give it back; because since the act in itself is honourable, one is bound by justice to restore it, even though the petitioner grievously sins in his asking, as we said in no. 944. Dub. 1.

Si vero actus est venialiter illicitus ex parte ipsius actus vel copulae, ut si petatur in situ innaturali vel tempore menstrui aut puerperii, tunc quando adest justa causa potest quidem reddere cum qualibet justa causa excusat à veniali. Justa autem causa erit, v.g., ne incurrat indignationem alterius sive rancorem illi quoddammodo notabilem, et non possit modo comode evertere. The cause which Sanchez adduces, namely that the spouse may not be deprived of his right to provide for himself, does not seem

sufficient, for one who seeks an improper thing at that time has no right to such a request; nor does the other have a right to have it given to him. I said that he can render it, but is not bound to do so, because although the bond of justice is stronger than the bond of charity, nevertheless, since the act is in such a way illicit by itself, another does not have the right to demand this, and thus the response holds for the reason given in the first sentence; just as in 3 c. 3 n. 89. Also, Palac. et: d. D. 16 n. 8. And they probably think Croix n. 356. with S., therefore, if innatural, he is not bound. Indeed, however, he would be bound to give back if the petitioner had a just cause presumed from his own part for such petitioning, for example, if he requested a conjugal union in an unnatural situation; and if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, since it is odious, strict, and to be taken with severity regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary, if some confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another three years after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, since it is odious, strict, and to be taken with severity regarding ordinary election but not extraordinary; see the aforementioned n. 917.

Or si peccatum tempore menstrui, aut puerperii cum periculo incontinentiae; juxta dicta n. 925 circa finem. Nevertheless, the husband is bound to return the petition immediately [amounting to] 506 libras. VI. Treatise. VI.

On Marriage. after dinner? See what is said at no. 910. v. and in the Tract on the day of the Ancestor, feast day, fast day, and Rogation. See nos. 923 and 947 Question NoneIII. Is it licit for a wife to repay a debt or sue for semen from her willing husband to be sown outside the vessel after copulation has been initiated?

The first opinion affirms this, and it is held by Pont. 1. 10 c. 11 n. 8, 7 c. 4 § 5 n. 4, and Sporer p. 356 n. 490, because (as they say) when a woman repays or seeks what is due, she renders service to a legitimate matter; hence she herself should not be deprived of her rightful claim on account of the malice of the husband. The second opinion, which they hold, is that the wife neither can ask for nor give back, unless there be a grave cause, which itself excuses in permitting the husband's sin and in cooperating with that material sin; otherwise she is bound by charity, since it is possible to impede the husband's sin without great inconvenience. I however distinguish: Si agatur de reddendo debito, dico uxorem probabiliter posse et tenêri negare debitum, si possit sine gravi

incommodo, juxta secundam sententiam allatam n. 944, quia abusurus re sibi debita non habet jus ad rem sibi vindicandam; sed probabilius apparet uxorem non solum posse reddere, ut dict prima sententia quam sequitur praesumptum 9 D. 16 n. 3, sed praesumptum tenêri. Radio, quia juxta dicta cit. n. 944., quando culpa se tenet ex parte personæ petentis, cum ipse habeat jus ad copulam, nequit alter sine injustitia debitum negare, si non possit monendo à tali culpa illum avertere, et tunc patet, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. reddens ne materialiter quidem cooperetur peccato illius, cum non cooperetur semina tioni extra vas, sed tantùm copulae inceptæ, quæ per se omnino utrique est licita. Si vero agatur de petitione debiti, dico cum secunda sententia, uxorem non posse petere, si non adsit justa et gravis causa; tunc enim vere tenetur ex charitate impedire peccatum viri.

Would have a just cause for petitioning, if herself were in danger of incontinence, or if she ought otherwise to be deprived of her right to petition according to Chapter II. Doubt. II. On Marriage itself. Once or twice, when there is a perpetual scruple whether it is sufficiently grave inconvenience, or not, then to abstain; See what has been said in similar cases l. 2 n. 53 v. If truly. « 6.

Is not bound to render reason. If one to another owes something and has remitted it, for instance, if by mutual consent they have promised chastity (but it is contrary to what is probable, if they do not intend to yield according to what was said in no. 944 concerning the end), or if they have had a divorce celebrated with public authority. If the petitioner is insane; because such a person is not capable of the use of dominion; nor does he petition with reason, and in a human manner. » If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year period, as being odious, strict, and to be accepted as such for ordinary election but not for extraordinary, presumes in an intoxicated person. Simply speaking, as one may petition, so may one return; whether inebriated or insane, except where there is a danger of the fetus being killed. 16 Sylv.

If another adulterer has been, because "faith broken by faith is broken to him likewise; except that he himself also be an adulterer, or be the cause of adultery." (See to be explained n. 956.) The question is: whether the wife is bound to render the debt of infidelity, or of one in a state of madness or intoxication? They affirm also Sylvius. If another is an

adulterer, because "faith broken by faith is broken to him likewise; unless himself also be an adulterer, or a cause of adultery." * (From the notes on n. 956.) * . » Question None, whether the wife is bound to give back what was given in madness or drunkenness? Graff. c. 1 n. 293. Because an intoxicated husband, or one made insane, still retains dominion over the acquired body of another; nor does madness hinder procreation. They however commonly and more reasonably deny this with Bussemh, as stated above, in Decretals 9, chapter 22, number 9.

Croix n. 394. et cum Soto, Con. They indeed commonly and more probingly deny it with Busemeh, as was stated above in D. 22 num. 9. Croix n. 394. et cum Soto, Con. Victor. Shorn. Henry.

Reason, because although these may possess dominion, they are nevertheless incapable of the use of dominion. Receive 1. if there be in them a danger of wasting seed, because although they themselves do not sin, yet the act is nevertheless hindered which would materially be evil. Consider this 2: if someone were not completely insane, but only in one or another particular; or if he were merely foolish and not entirely captivated by his mind; or if he should beg while having a moment of clarity; Bossuet nos. 298 and 299. Although there is no obligation to give to the insane husband or the drunken one, it is nevertheless lawful for him to give, as the aforementioned authors commonly say, since the use of matrimony in itself is lawful and children can be educated by a spouse of sound mind. Now (to be understood) let it be avoided that there be danger of scandal or abortion; hence they properly add n. 302, if a penitent is chosen as an addition, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the addition, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict and to be understood concerning ordinary election but not extraordinary, does not prevent cohabitation with a madwoman known through experience to be sterile, if she be insane and furious. It would be a presumption to join in copulation spouses both of whom are insane, because thereby the offspring would lack proper education; and Lop. et P. Soto, Fill. etc. Even though he who knowingly and prudently contra propter scientiam marries his consanguineous wife in the first or second degree does not have the right to demand a legitimate issue *(ex c. i de Eo qui cognovit etc. Vide dicenda ex n. 107o)*, nevertheless he is bound to provide.

The same applies to him who, insidiously having taken part, violated chastity after the consummation of marriage; but if he had done so before, it would appear that he is obligated to enter religion at least for a saltpeter premonition (unless, indeed, the marriage has been consummated): otherwise presumptuously after, provided the wife consents, about which

see more in [Resp. 2]. The wife is not bound to make amends, if on account of a grave harm or disgrace feared by herself or for her offspring she justifiably fears it, Perez dist. 5o sess. 4. Wherefore » is not bound in the following cases. > 1. If the husband seeks to incur contamination through a contagious disease such as pestilence, leprosy, etc., (unless, however, this has already been known prior to Marriage and is not excessively severe), Perez d. 50. g d. 14. 5. tr. 10 p. 3 c. 2.

» Quidquid quaeritur de conjugi, ut reddat debitum alibi laboranti quocienlibet morbo contagioso, puta lepra, peste, phthisi, morbido gallico et similis? It is certain that i. Wives are bound to give what is their own with some slight loss, for justice law prevails here; it obliges under a grave obligation, because the repayment of a debt is gravely burdensome matter; thus commonly Sanch, l. g D. 24 n. 2 with Soto, l. 2 c. 1 num. 168 at the end with Bon. Reply. ' and Vall.

Whereunder they say that in Quaestio 64, Article 1, Answer 4, and Chapter II. Doubt. II. Regarding marriage by itself. 50g D. l. c. n. 15 uxorem tenêri ad reddendum debitum viro leproso, ex c. 2 de Conjug. lepros. ubi: Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. si virum, sive uxorem, leprosum fieri contigerit, et infirmus d sano carnale debitum exigat, generali praecepto Apostoli, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. quod, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. exigi- tur est solvendum; qui praecepto in hoc casu nulla excep- tio invenitur. Reason, because, when a brief connection is formed, no danger of infection arises from it: and hence it is said in D. 1 ad 4 [De] Tenendum reddere.... but not nevertheless to cohabit, ibid., because it does not so easily contaminate by intercourse, though it may happen on account of frequent cohabitation.

However commonly that is limited 1. DD. Si ex tali coitu judicio Medicorum adsit periculum infectionis notabiliter noxiae; ita et. D 24 n. 17

cum S. Antonius . Limitant 2 si coniux sanus tantum horroris habeat ad coeundum cum leproso, ut sit hoc moraliter impossibile; nam nulla est obligatio ex liceitatis imperio super impossibilium. Impossibilitum ff. de Reg. jur. ità n. 149 cum Host. Panorm. . . It is certain that a husband cannot be held liable to render his wife what is due from him with great danger to his own life or health; thus D. 1 where it states: A husband is held liable to render his wife what is due,... provided however the person's safety is first secured.

And thus commonly all (see .). D. 24 n. 2.) Ratio, quia (ut ait ; et hic est etiam ordinem caritatis, qua naturam perficit. It is certain 3. A consort, not only not to be violated; but also not even able to be rendered with grave risk to one's own salvation, because no one is master of his own life; thus commonly in book 10 chapter 14 number 3 of the pontifical law, and D. 24 number 8 with Soto, Cajetan. Arm. c. 1 n. 199 cum etc. Et hoc etiàsi illud grave damnum immineret soli petenti, ut dicitur n. 209 cum Soto, Limio Lib.

VI. Treatise. VI. On Marriage. But truly, as they say, in all contracts, when a defect in the thing is discovered, the parties are no less bound than if the thing were defective. But they meritously reject this limitation. c. et Ang. ac.

However, it is nevertheless probable that a husband may deliver to another one who is infected with a supposed malady, when there is great risk to his own health. I. Sed meruit hanc limitationem rejiciunt . c. et Ang. ac . If offspring are necessary for the common good; D. 24 n. 11 cum Ledesma, nemine contradicente, ut asserit, II: Si Conjux infectus petens esset in probabili periculo incontinentiae, nam licet sanus nec praesumptum eo casu teneatur reddere cum periculo suae sa- ni-tatis, ut dicunt Pont. 1. 10 c. 14 n. 2. . 24 n. 12. ac .) tum quia charitas non obligat cum tanto onere, tum quia alter non est in extrema necessitate, cum possit aliter sibi subveni- re; attamen licite potest reddere, et tale periculum suhire ex motivo charitatis, quia, esto homo non sit dominus suae vitæ, potest tamen propter charitatem illam exponere, ut Pont. l. c. n. 4 et c. 2 n. 7. 3 et 4 et Soto, III. Si redderet ad vitandas magna dissidia vel ad fovendum amorem conjugalem, et praesumptum ad vitandum periculum incontinentiae propriæ, et tunc potest praesumptum petere; quia vitatio incontinentiae, aut conservatio pacis familias ac amoris jugalis praevalent obligationi vitandi infectionis periculum. These nonetheless are all to be understood (as we said in n. 909, if a disease is long-lasting and quasi habitual, such as leprosy or the galea).

Doubt. II. On Marriage itself. 5i licus, phthisis, etc., not truly if it is about

those which often bring about death quickly and easily, such as infection by pestilence or leprosy of leonine type. IV. I add: if a Healthy Spouse can easily avoid contagion or its danger through preventive measures. Moreover, a healthy spouse cannot render an infirm one weak in such a way as to endanger his own salvation; similarly, an infected one who is not already sick cannot render another healthy person sick with his danger; even if he has already asked for absolution from his own peril: just as it is not lawful for someone willing to kill himself to give the sword to another who does not wish to die, so that no man shall be lord of his own life; thus D. 6 n. 17.

Pont. "1. 10 n. 2 in fin. et etc. commonly." Probabiliter tamen excipiunt. 24. n. 23 cum Cajet. P. Soto, et Crass. ac Boss. d. n. 209 in fin. (se remittens ad num. 195) cum si reddat ad vitandum periculum incontinentiae in se vel in altero, vel ad vitanda dissidia, aut ne diu privetur usu conjugii, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Vix esse potest sine periculo incontinentiae. This must be understood as presumptively applicable if the disease is prolonged and not proximate to death; also, if another person who is now conscious that he himself is subject to such a disease, according to what is stated in n. 909 Dub. 1.

An autem Conjux possit et teneatur reddere quando timetur damnum prolis nasciturae? Medina et Palacius negant quod quisque sit tenendum nec possit redimere debitem cum damno innominantis. But commonly and more truly it is affirmed [by them]. S. Bonaventura Mire.

Sylv. 1 n. 136 with Soto, Layman; Reb. Fill. Reg. Thom. 1. e. ubi: The wife is bound to render what is owed to the leprous husband; and even if the offspring that is born may be infirm, nevertheless it is sweet and thus ought to be so; yet entirely not to be. But is it permissible to render something during the time of pregnancy, or menstruation, or after purification following childbirth?

See what is said at n. 924; 925 and 926. • 2. If he should ask his pregnant wife for conjugal relations, or if she is suffering from a fever or some other illness to which cohabitation would be harmful? » from c. * (Whether after bathing or after a venesection; see what was said at n. goi.) Or, as some hold, during menstruation: 10 against d. 49 s. 3. » (Vide dicta n. g25.) Aut cum uxor est gravida, et ex redditione periculum mortis (vel praesumptum abortus) probabile timetur proli jam conceptae: imò tunc nec petere, nec reddere licitum est, ut per se patet, ait 7 et esse mortale dict: Perez dist. 47

s. 3 (addens ex) * Aut si non possit uxor edere foetum nisi mortuum. (si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Bon. l. c. concedit, si fiat ob periculum incontinentiae aut non possit edere, nisi cum præsenti periculo vitæ.

Bon. l. c. n. 7. c n. 6. If a penitent be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be received more stringently regarding ordinary than extraordinary choice. Nevertheless, to avoid incontinence or some grave cause, one can permit and fulfill that which is due. This is said from chapter 7 of the Decree, decree 102, note ii * (See dicenda n. seq. g53). Finally, on account of a grave peril of death (a) (notwithstanding ordinary pangs of labor), the wife can deny what is due; even though there be a peril of incontinence in another respect. (See previously mentioned preceding notes and verses.) Probably to II. » 3. If another demands a debt in an unnatural manner, except that worse evils be feared from negation, for instance.

quarrels, hatred, lust * (See what is said at note g46.) Commonly held is that to return a wife is not a debt due, if experienced [in matters], she be unable to bear children without risk of probable danger of death: thus 7. . 7 D. 102 n. 9 and Bössius c. i n. 172 with Conin. Rec.: Fill. et Rod.,quia solutio debiti non obligat cum tanti detrimento. What if a woman who has experienced it is aware that she cannot give birth without risk of death? In this case, it has been said that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be suitably confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious, strict, and to be received in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary, makes it such that a wife may appropriately render, because that death is an accidental occurrence of pregnancy according to Chapter II. Doubt.

II. Of Marriage in itself. You inquire whether at any time it is permissible to hinder the generation of offspring. » Resp. Conjuges possunt certe ex gravi causa aliquid facere, ex quo per accidens sequatur effusio seminis: tamen peccant, si in usu Matrimonii vel post usum faciant aliquid, qua impediat conceptionem, aut seminem conceptum rejiciat.

The reason for the prior one is, 'because generation is not impeded, neither indirectly but merely permitted so that it may not take place, if a Confessor be chosen as an addition, it can well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement; because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. This is allowed for reasonable cause. The reason for the latter is, because they act against faith and the principal end of marriage. Wherefore such poverty is neither excused by imminent necessity, nor by danger arising from childbirth. Wherefore it is resolved. ».Licitly is interrupted the act of conjugal intercourse; even though pollution would ensue thereby according to the prompting of nature, provided that there be a just cause for interrupting it, e.g., if imminent danger of illness or death from an enemy, or some other person, intervene.

Behold. It is permitted by the decree of 49, section general * (praesumptum: g D. 19 n. 4; c. g n: 60 cum c.: 15 n. 8i cum Peccat probabiliter foemina, quæ in usu matrimonii animum alio distrahit, ne natura excitetur, venialiter tamen; ut ex Per. 1. c. num. 7. docet . 918. v. But returning, she distracts the mind of a widow by another thing, lest nature be excited; yet venially; as Per. 1. c. num. 7. teaches. » 918. v. But returning), *. They say. g D. 20 n. 3. Pont. 1. 10 c. 13 n. 1. 75. cum ac cum Fill.

Broom. If Diana and Vil. a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious, strict, and to be received as concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a woman commits mortal sin, she shall be considered morally guilty, if immediately after copulation she defecates or urinates, or does some other thing with intent that the received seed be expelled from her; because it frustrates the end for which the seed is instituted by nature; so do the aforementioned AA. against chapter 7 section 3 paragraph 5 note 14, who excuses this with Bellochio as mortal sin if a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious, strict, and to be received as concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. For in the woman's matrix, if seed has been ejaculated, it shall always remain there; if a confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years is so odious, strict, and to be received as concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. It is necessary for generation. It was

said, however, that if a woman does this immediately and with the intention of expelling the seed, for if she were to do it from any necessity, such as to avoid the danger of death or scandal to others, all would say that she does not sin; It is fittingly presumed that there is no need for a wife after copulation to remain motionless and reclinable for a long time, so if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another three-year period following the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a three-year term, inasmuch as it is odious, strict, and to be accepted of ordinary election, not extraordinary one; indeed, when the seed is quickly drawn to the matrix and most tightly closed. It is doubted whether this virgin girl, violently oppressed, can expel immediately the semen inserted by a man, so that she does not conceive? They affirm. 2 D. 2 2. n. 1 7. et Boss. c. 9 n. 5. cum Raynaud.

Marchant. and Diana, and not improbable thinks Escob. 1. 2 5 n. 3 0 1. quia (as they say) then a virgin lawfully expels the semen of one who has attacked her at her own hour, since that does not yet hold in pacific possession of the uterus. But more correctly it is not admitted - Pontius 1. 9 c. 10 n. 4. . 1. 7 c. 3 § 5 n. 14. et hanc netet et hi templi veriorem Escob. 1. cit. cum Leand. Huec idem et adhaesit 1. 3 num. 3 9 4. v. They say that I am also adhered to ethics, even though the reduction of the distinction is drawn differently. The reason why this opinion is found to be probable is because it seems that no one can receive the effectual grace and remission of sins in a small part as well as in any other; wherefore, when the sacrament is administered (which I hold to be received immediately), there remains peace and possession; whence a woman cannot lawfully expel who has incurred an injury either from Nature or from human law whose propagation is hindered.

However, commonly it is said by AA: both the primary and the secondary sentences, because many women being oppressed are brought to Chapter H. Doubt. III. In the matter of marriage, it follows that (I mean to say, it is held), interrupting coitus and expelling the semen, even though it was outside the vessel about to be discharged; for then the semen that has been introduced is not expelled, but merely hindered from being emitted, and hence it is then lawfully repelled like a violent aggressor of honor. Dubit. 2: Whether it is permissible for spouses to copulate if it frequently happens on account of old age or some other disposition; and whether, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; and that, if a Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he

can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, when semen is extraversed from the vessel?

They probably affirm . 3 . 9 D. 17 n. 24. with Henry and Cross n. 318. with Gabriel; thus, provided there is a reasonable hope of impregnation within the vessel, because such a hope always exists, they have the right to copulate; and if semen is discharged, this happens by chance: see the commentary n. 1066. at the end. DOUBT III. Whoever and for what causes a divorce can occur? G55 A divorce occurs as regards the bond. If there are sufficient indications of the death of the spouse. II.

If the other one converts to Faith. III. If a Religious becomes such before the consummation. IV. If the Pope dispenses in Marriage the reason. g56 Concerning the Indissolubility of Matrimony. g57 May it be asked, if an Infidel refuses to convert, is it lawful for the Faithful to enter into other nuptials? g58 A marriage ratified by Faith is dissolved only through religious profession. g59 Is it dissolved presumptively through a papal dispensation P. g60 Divorce is permitted up to the Torah, I, on account of adultery of the Conjugate. g61 Qu.

I. Whether the reception of the adultery suffices for divorce. II. May it be licit to procure a divorce on account of sodomy, or bestiality committed by the Spouse? Sure.

Qu. III. An object connected by copula without semination? g63 Qu. IV.

Is a man bound to leave her when he learns of his wife's adultery? V. Is a wife bound to turn away from adultery with wine? And is an innocent husband bound to receive back an adulterer amended? VI. In which cases may the wife be unable to turn away from adultery?

In which cases may the spouse not be able to turn away from adultery? Case, if both are liable to adultery. II. Cases, if both are the case of adultery. If the husband imputes adultery to the wife wrongly. III.

If 516.....
-.....
(.....
(.....
(.....

Dub. III. On Marriage itself. §1. » that he may will to live in cohabitation without contumely towards the Creator; » this is by divine dispensation, for the sake of the faith; » as is evident from 1 Cor. 7:15.

Perez. d. 26 s. 4 et hoc est; » commune. » III. If before the consummation of marriage (to which within a first bimetre, if a Confessor is chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, as odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary), to the deliberation; "the permission given, are not bound, nor can they be compelled without 'injury' another enters Religion, into which he is professed." Perez. I. c. etc. communijer.

IV. If the Pope dispenses from a just cause prior to consummation, as the probable sentential opinion affirms. Perez. d. 20 sect. 7. It is certain that if a penitent is chosen for supplementation, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a penitent beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received regarding an ordinary election, not extraordinary; since, among Catholics, Matrimony is indissoluble, as it has been declared. Et hoc per se rerum est, non solum de Matrimonio consummato; sed praesumptum de tantum rato, vide : q. 4 ex n. ii; Haec autem indissolubilitas est ab ipsa jure naturali, quia necessarium est ad prolis educationem, ut Parentes perpetuo ejus bona incumabant; ita communissime; D. 1. Bell.

Regarding matrimony. I. I c. 12. Pont. I. i c. 12, "et quum etc. Contra. 2 D. 15 n. 7. qui cum aliis tenet (sed minus probabiliter) ex se praecise Matrimonium non esse necessario indissolubile." Although nevertheless formerly among the Jews the Book of repudiation was permitted, according to 9: Whoever hath dismissed his wife, except for fornication, and shall have married another, committeth adultery.

Where noted, if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be accepted with odious strictness in regard to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. To nisi ob fornicationem (ut communiter explicant Interpretes, vide Certum est 2, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post

tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. inter infideles validum sit. Marriage, if it has been legitimate, that is to say celebrated according to laws, as is apparent from the Greek. Of to Faith, it is converted.

Let the marriage be made valid, that is, indissoluble, according to c. Quantum de dyor. Let it be consummated after conversion; otherwise, the Pope may in some case dissolve it on account of urgent cause, as we said in number 897 verse. Prob. 1 ex Decr. Urban VIII and furthermore defended Benedict. XIV. in a certain Dissertation which is entitled concerning the Synod I. 6 c. 4 n. 5 where he asserts, S. Pius V and Gregory.

XIII. id in praxis deduxisse. It is certain that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary. If one convert and the other does not wish to live together except with injury from the Creator or with blasphemy of the Divine Name, then the faithful may freely enter another marriage, as expressed in said chapter. As much as where it is said that a faith- ful person can pass to another marriage for three reasons: 1 if the unbeliever refuses to live with him, 2 if he wishes to live with him but only except with injury from the Creator, 3 if he desires to draw him into mortal sin. Questio est: An liceret Fideli ab Infidele separari, non solum quantum ad torum, sed etiam quantum ad vinculum, si Infidelis nolit converti, sed tamen velit pacificè cohabitare sine injuria Creatoris? There are three sentences. The first one absolutely negates this and holds it. Estius in 36 q. 1 a. 5, d. 4, § 3g, chap. 6. Furthermore, S. Bonaventura.

St. Antony. Palud. l. 7 D. 74 num. 8. They prove that from the Apostolical decree I. Cor. 7 v. 12 ubi: Si quis frater uxorem habet infidelem, et haec consentit habitare cum illo, non dimittat illam. The second opinion absolutely affirms, and Bellarmine holds this in the third opinion to be shortly adduced from the Ratio: But it is said that Bellarmine did not relate Paul's text as containing a precept, but merely as a counsel, since the Apostle immediately subjoined the words meant; While I say otherwise, not as the Lord.

Third therefore is the sentiment more common and more probable, which they hold, c. n. 9. Pont. l. 9 c. 4 n. 22. t. ii p. 119 et alii apud dictum olim si nullum adeat periculum perversionis non potuisse Fidemem transire ad alias nuptias quia non aderat causa discedendi a Conjugi infidieli cum per miracula quae frequenter tunc per Fideles fiebant plures Infideles ad Fidem convertebantur; Sed hodie cum cæsaverint miracles. Dub. III. On Marriage itself. The frequency is such that it is illicit to cohabit with an Unfaithful Spouse according to received ecclesiastical custom, which has been introduced so that if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition of not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary. Experience has shown that not a small danger of perdition exists from association with the Unfaithful; unless (excepting Tourn. l. c. et 75 n. 13.) the Bishop dispenses for cohabitation on account of the probable hope of conversion of that person.

True; however, it is to be adverted with care, c. et Petrocor. d. p. 43 i ex cit. cap., quantum si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. The marriage shall not be dissolved until the Faithful pass over to other nuptials. If a Confessor be elected for a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Therefore, if a Confessor be elected for a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. Before a Faithful contracts another marriage, he ought to admonish the Unbeliever, if he wishes to convert him, from precept and S. Pius V., as the Pontiffs say, 1-7 c. 48: n. 23. 74 n. 12. et Croix n. 408. He nevertheless takes it with others, against the canon that if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, as odious and strict as it is with ordinary election, not with extraordinary one; because in case where

an Infidel cannot be admonished before the faithful contracts other marriages, it requires the dispensation of the Pontiff. As the preface has already decreed. Amaritudo autem inter eos numquam solvi- tur, nisi alter Conjugus intra bimestre ad Matrimonium contractum et non consummatum Religionem ingrederi debet, ut habetur in c. Si quis conjugatus. 27 q. 7. Et hoc tamen intelligitur, prout diximus n. 87o in fine; modo Matrimonium non esset necessarium ad legitimandam prolem vel reparandum scandalum aut honorem Sponsae, tunc enim non posset vir fieri Religiosus reliquoendo Sponsam quae ob infamiam nequiret amplius Nuptias invenire.

They say moreover. 2. D. 25 n. 7. They say: 1.9 c. 9 n. 7 and also D. 25 n. 7: If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he can properly be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, is understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary; if a married person should enter Religion having transacted bisexually, he would illicitly profess this here, but validly, since the Council indistinctly pronounced thus: If anyone says that a marriage not consummated by solemn profession of Religion on the part of the other spouse is not dissoluble, let him be anathema. That is to say, for Matrimony to be considered consummated, not merely sufficient penetration of the female's part is required, but it is necessary that there be an effusion of seed therein; thus commonly do the Doctors with Hic agree. Anyone however can intra bimestre debitum negare conjugum lioite, quamvis non habeat animum intrandi Religionem; quia utitur jure suo; ita communiter n. 91 cum Soto Con. . 870.

D. 2 at the end) Groom who enters into Matrimony with the intent to enter Religion. §59, 'And can the Pope by dispensation dissolve a Marriage that is void; and not consummated?' There are two probable opinions; the first denies this, and this is held by Pope 1. 9 c. 3 n. 3. . 3 p. 2 §. 2 n. 3. Gonet. D. 5 n. 13 item S. Soto, 9, 5 n. 58. Reason, because marriage ratified by its nature is consummated, whose indissolubility (as declared the Second Sententia affirms, and they hold with Bus.).

D. 14 n. 2. Bellar. 1. 2, de 21 et 61 cum [illegible] supervening impotency, or imminent scandal, or newly known sterility, when there was need for it to the public good, for offspring to be generated. They add a presumption if there is disparity of condition, a contagious disease, foreseen dissensions, and the consent of many husbands; But these four causes He does not admit. For otherwise, with these admitted, few marriages would be ratified and firmly stand. Chapter II. Doubt.

III. On Marriage itself. - Article 1. "Response 2." While the bond of matrimony remains, it is licit to effect a divorce, and separation of bed, and cohabitation ad tempus, or in perpetuum, for a grave and just cause, such as: I. If one partner has committed culpable adultery (if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, it may well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict that it should be understood of ordinary election and not extraordinary. This presumption comprehends every species of licentiousness in which flesh is divided from itself, such as bestiality, and presumed sodomy within the same sex. 56 s. 1 et 2 ex "Non tamen mollities, vel pollutio oscula, tactus, vel amplexus impudici." Bon. 1. c. licet propter similia ad tempus possit aliquando fieri separatio ut nocens emendetur); tunc enim innocens Religionem ingressus, aut Sacros Ordines praesumptive suscipere potest: nocens vero non, nisi cum innocentis consentio. Excipitur tamen ab hoc casu 1.

If both spouses are partakers in that crime, or are equal [in guilt]. .10d. 6. Bon. 1. c. Nisi innocens alteri condonari, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accepienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria; quod aliqui eum fecisse censent si eam post adulterium intellectum rursus cognoverit. Bonifacius ex concilii Henrici. Fill. By. s. 3 ubi vide plures casus except os.

It is certain that a husband can put away his wife for adultery, as I have taught: Christ said. Matthew 5. reading and expression are found in ch. Gaudemus c. Ex litteris etc. You have signified concerning divorce. The same is commonly said by the DD., regarding the adulterous husband whom the wife can leave; thus. D. 3 n. 6. Pont. 1. g c. 16 et Bon.: Quaeritur.

I. Whether it suffices to suggest a slight suspicion regarding the adultery of the spouse for the purpose of obtaining a divorce? If a confessuator is chosen for the supplement, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessuator beyond a triennium, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary. It suffices that only a suspicion exists, which is expressed in c. Hieronymus said: Wherever there is fornication or the suspicion of fornication, the wife is freely dismissed. Communiter tamen advertunt! D. 35 q. un. as 3 ad 4. 8 a. 2 n. 4. 10. D. 12 u. 4 q cum S. Bonav.

Saint Austin. Marsh. Soto, Innoc. How do you know? chapter on Presumption. Now however this must be understood: if a penitent is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be interpreted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; although in the internal forum such great certitude is not required as in the external, yet always there must be such suspicion, that non solely probability but moral certitude of adultery perpetrated is to be held; otherwise (as he well says), by mere probable impiety another might be deprived of his certain possession.

Hence, unless other circumstances are present, hugs, touches, and kisses do not suffice to make a divorce; as Pontius states in book 9, chapter 16, note 5, edition e, page 6, section 1, note 2 with note 45: however, it is sufficient in the forum of conscience if an exceptionally trustworthy man testifies to adultery or to a violent indication; thus in the letter of the loving wife, it is stated that presumptions suffice, as if she were confessing by means of a letter wherein she admits premeditated adultery. And thus I think that a presumed sufficiency is sufficient if one person alone lies with another alone in the same bed. Seek. May a divorce be permitted on account of sodomy or bestiality committed by the Spouse? The first sentiment denies it, which Innocent [estimates] in lib. 16.

D. 4 num. 2: hanc sequitur, speculativè loquendo, praesumptum Pontificis l. 9 c. 16 n. 5. The reason is, firstly because through mere fornication the flesh is divided; secondly because a law previously established, such as this one, ought not to be extended from case to case; the text in c. Gaudemus and c. Litteris de Divor. supra, speak only of fornication alone. The second opinion, however, is more widespread and probable (at least extrinsically), and this is what Chapter II affirms. Doubt. III.

On Marriage itself. Section 52, paragraph 1, note 4, chapter 3, or bestiality. It does not hinder if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is held thus regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For the penal law should not be extended, for the right to depart from an adulterer, who divides his body with another, does not arise from positive law, but from natural law itself. If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, he may be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, is held thus regarding ordinary

election, not extraordinary. The prohibition prevents the conjugation with another body. But the doctors of the first Sentences could always repeat that true division of flesh is never without natural copulation. Furthermore, it is well said by the Pontiff in the aforementioned place, that one ought not to depart from this sentence, since it is common, but truly it should not be approved. Questio.

III. Let there be a connection existing between an internal and an external without any seminum discharge, be it a sufficient cause for divorce. The first opinion affirms, and holds this, Bonaventure. Silent, Sylv. Marsh.

Vega and Henry. Reason does not assign it, but rather seems to be so, because fornication without semination is true fornication, even though not consummated, which truly divides the flesh; citing a presumptuous authority. The second truly probable opinion denies it and holds that. 10. D. 4 n. 13. Escob. l. 25 n. 13 et .

Reason, because by the name fornication is meant in its own genus the perfected fornication, namely consummated through semination; otherwise there would be no true division of flesh, but rather a pretended division, for through semination alone those who commit fornication become one flesh. Quære. IV. Is a man, knowing his wife to be an adulteress, bound to put her aside? By reason of adultery, certainly is not bound to do so, since this dismissal has been permitted by Christ the Lord alone, and not as a precept.

Augustine thus said: But the Lord permitted the wife to be dismissed on account of fornication, but because He permitted it, not as just, He gave room for this Apost. §24... Lib. VI. Treatise. VI: On Marriage... concerning the dissolution of matrimony, so that he who has vowed, does not dismiss an unfaithful wife. The reason is evident, because divorce has been introduced for the sake of the innocent party; hence, it ought not to be punished as a true offense.

Only on account of fraternal correction or to avoid scandal may a man be held bound to leave his wife who has committed adultery; this is taught by S. Th. l. c., in the section On Adultery where it is said: If a man, knowing that his wife has sinned against him and having failed to repent but remains obstinate, should cohabit with her, he will be guilty of sin and bear its consequences. But if some Confessor be chosen as a supplement, he can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is so odious, strict, and to be accepted as pertaining to ordinary election rather than extraordinary, which generally the Doctors

declare not to bind one to correct the man by other means, namely words or blows: thus c. ad 1. ac, § Covar. J. 10: D. 13. n. 9. Item nec tenetur, si ex tali dimissione timeat gravia incommoda, nimirum periculum propriae incondimentae, vel rixas cum proprio uxore, vel infamiam aut jutorum gubernationis domesticae et similia, quia praeceptum correptionis non obligat, nisi graviori incommodo, ita S. Anton. 3. p. tit. 2. c. 20. § 9. Ponteius l. 9. c. 17 n. 4.

Bon. d. a. 13. et cum. Soto, Palud., c. 7 n. 15. 8 a. 2 n. 5., si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si putet vir, hac sola via adulteram corrigendam esse, eo: casu teneatur ex charitate (intellige si possit absque gravi incommodo) ad tem- pus eam dimittere. If a confessor be elected for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not electing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in respect to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. For this reason also, if a confessor be elected for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition of not electing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in respect to ordinary election, but not extraordinary. Furthermore, it pertains to scandal that a man presume to dismiss his wife, lest it seem that he consents to her sin. Caus. 28. q. 1 ibi: Si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si in his faotis perseverat, quodse ab illa. Si autem, et tu participes peccati illius eius.

This nevertheless is understood: as say St. Anthony, loc. cit. Pontius, and ibid. if adultery be chapter Cap. II. Doubt. III. Regarding marriage in itself. Notorious is it if open, but not if hidden. It is understood 2. to be separated . n. 5. and Fill. et ; but if otherwise it were possible by another way, namely through wife-reproach, confinement, beating, or some other moderate coercion.

If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed by another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition

against choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, must be understood concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary one. If, with these means employed, scandal persists, he shall be considered worthy of rebuke, if the wife does not dismiss him for just cause, namely reason of danger to his own self-indulgence, or if he labors in poverty or illness, and hence needs the aid of his wife; or if otherwise he should suffer great damage; or if his wife otherwise should deteriorate or flee, or such a notable harm threatened his health; or if there exists a probable hope that the wife may recover soon, as taught by S. n. 3... D. 13 ex n. 19 with Soto and Navarrus. Mire. Major. Tablet. Grace.

Angel. Ric. and having cited all the aforementioned causes, let them excuse them and propose them. They add that it suffices to override the cause if there would be multiple expenses pending, so as to divert authority from the Judge; or if they fear disputes arising from the divorce. Finally D. Anton concludes thus: Therefore a man is not bound (to his wife) to drive her away with detriment to his own right and peril. Thus say the aforementioned authors; but others, with probable reason, hold that if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, to be understood more of the ordinary election than of the extraordinary; if indeed a man has already shown sufficient indicia that he would not readily endure his wife's adultery, he is not bound to dismiss her on account of scandal; for if others are scandalized thereby, their scandal will be Pharisaical. Thus it should not himself avoid it, so long as he consents thereto, according to N. 17. cum Palud., who says: If Marius explains this, if a Confessor be chosen for a supplement, he can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, to be understood more of the ordinary election than of the extraordinary; thus one should not foster that in sin, but rather retain oneself according to him, so as to hold back the person from sin.

If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; if however someone is scandalized, the scandal is from malice. If a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a confessor beyond three

years, inasmuch as it is odious and strictly to be accepted regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; if however someone is scandalized, the scandal is from malice. It is contemned. The Glossa also understands in the chapter Non solum, as cited above, where it explains at the words, "Sine tamen; et tu particeps peccati illius eris": Id est, si non revocas eam de propria mente. Therefore, a man who revokes an adulteress from purpose is not to be rejected as a partaker in that sin; this is more clearly taught by D. Antoninus, 1. c., where he says: On account of the scandal of the Pharisees, a man is not bound to yield his right; before he should expose himself (the husband) if a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it may be well confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be observed from ordinary election, not from extraordinary one; therefore, when a confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the term of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a confessor beyond a triennium is to be observed from ordinary election, not from extraordinary one. he should not nourish her in sin, but rather, so that she may better be held back from sin; and since this is probable, if anyone is scandalized thereby, it will not be the scandal of the weak, and because he cannot yield without danger to himself, lawfully he can retain her. Hymn from all Predicted properly infers: c. with Leduc and Abb., and with Soto, etc., if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it can well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is so odious and strict as to be understood of ordinary election, not of extraordinary. For this reason, the scandal rarely holds a man to allow his wife an adulterer to go unpunished. Question None

V. Is a wife bound to effect a divorce from an adulterous husband? The first sentiment, which S. l. 10 D. 14 n. 29 holds along with Pal Syl. Soto, Tab. Arm.

Sa, non on account of corruption, because it is solely the Superior's task to correct through action; whereas a wife is subject to her husband, hence (as stated by St. Anthony) she herself should not correct her husband through action, but only with words. However, the second opinion seems more plausible to me than that which Antoine holds on page 587, question 9, note 27, where he says it is presumed sometimes to deviate from the husband adulterer; because a subject is sometimes presumed obliged to correct the Superior in such a way as he can without great inconvenience; and still more so is this incumbent upon the wife who has already been permitted to leave an adulterous husband; provided that she knows for certain that her husband must be corrected by this means: but it would be

better if the Concilium stated thus, if there is a probable hope of amendment, because correction should properly be made where there is a probable hope, as they say. Rarely or very rarely indeed is a wife presumed to be corrected, firstly because very rarely can a wife reproach her husband; and secondly because very rarely will the wife be able to learn from him, according to Chapter II. Dub. III. On Marriage itself. Without serious inconvenience.

And indeed he is not considered to have presumptuously refused what is due to him: on the contrary, all the more so, because by refusing he would become worse, as teach S. c. c. et alii. Whether therefore an innocent spouse is bound to receive another one who has been corrected from adultery? They affirm that the Council 2 and Perez hold him bound by charity to do this, if otherwise he be in danger of relapse. Sed ego minimè auderem innocentem ad hoc obstringere sub culpa, cum ex una parte Christus Dom. eum perpetuò liberaverit ab obligatione cohabitandi cum adultero, et ex alia non videtur charitas ad tantum modo obligare, ut Conjux recipiat alterum, qui fregit sibi fidem. Wherefore they say it merits: "How ought I for the sake of honesty and decency to reconcile with him who has been corrected, if conveniently possible?"

If, however, a penitent is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; for if a confessor is elected as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. Concerning: If a man adulterer; He should; but not to provoke a sinner woman: for the Gloss explains 'Debet' as: Debet debito honestatis, non necessitatis.. Quær: VI. In which cases is it illicit for a Conjuge to divorce another in adultery? The first case is when both are guilty of adultery; for then neither has a right to divorce, even though one may have sinned once and secretly, while the other has sinned one hundred times and publicly; thus 19 D. 6n. 8, c. 16 n. 12 with Soto, Con. Thomas in IV D. 35 q. 1 a. 6 ad 5. It is doubted, however, whether in such a case the husband, having been reformed, may procure a divorce from the other spouse who continues in adultery?

There are two probable opinions! The first opinion denies it, unless he has already obtained pardon for his own crime; because their amendment does not, they say, extinguish an injury (even if committed once) to another. Thus the Pontiff, in book 9, chapter 17, at the end. It is said in the

Secondum, namely 'probable opinion, which they hold... 10 D. 7 n. 4. . 8 art. 1 n. 6. Turn.

Trul. Concordant. Good evening. Reg. n. 14 dict, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. amendatus possit separari ab altero, qui post cor- 528. Lb VI.

Treatise. Sixth. Of Marriage. The direction 'non reisipscit', Ratio, because (as it was said), after crimes both Conjuges might reconcile themselves; then, with one relabente, the other certe could recede: thus pari in praesenti casu, nam emendatus per ipsam corruptionem jam virtualiter offers reconciliationem, quam alter admittere tenetur, et sic terminus jam imponitur compensationi: ita ut alter non amplius habeat jus in posterum compensandi novum peccatum cum prae terito Conjugis emendati: et ideo ob novo adulterium juste tribuitur emendatus jus recedendi. The second case is if the spouse consents to adultery with another: then he loses the right to withdraw according to c. Discretionem de Eo qui cog., etc. And the common opinion agrees with 10 D. 5 n. 4. c. 16 n. 15. Cons. . Suppl. quaest. 62 artic. 1.

Tamen notandum est uniformiter, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary; quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary. Non sufficiet ad praesumptionem consensum viri si ille prudenter dissimulasset vel adulterium uxoris aversasset; eò si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary. Quod si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinary. Non potuerit sine magno incommodo; vel si causam tantum remotam praebuit ut si male eam tractavit; in allatis enim textibus statuit non excusari feminam adulterantem etiamsi à viro sit injustè dimissa. The third case is if the Conjux without formal guilt committed adultery, that is, either through an

innocent error or if she was forcibly taken; thus commonly stated c. ac n. 17. Otherwise, as noted by Notat praesumptum Dic., if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be confirmed well through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. That which, if a Confessor be chosen for the supplement, he can be confirmed well through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary.,if a woman supposing the husband to be dead cohabits extra marriage, a presumed man may dismiss her; likewise if a man fornicates supposing the wife to be dead. The fourth case is, if the injury is remitted, whether before or after divorce. If however after remission one is either relapsed or reconciled, or has reconciled oneself, the other already possesses the right to dismiss. 6 n. 7.

Remission is presumed to have been made either by words or by deeds, as if the Innocent Spouse, conscious and mindful of the adultery, should entirely of his own accord cohabit with the adulterer, as specified in Cap. II. Dub. III. On Marriage in itself. 52g cent S. art. 1. . 6 n. 19 et D 14 n. 6. Objection and others among the Bussi.

Signs are likewise signs of remission, if they remain in the same household, at the same table, on the same bed, especially if kisses, touches, embraces intervene. However, note this: if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be sufficiently confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary. For, if an innocent spouse truly does not have the intent to remit, he can always receive in conscience, although exteriorly divorce may be denied him; thus i 4 n. 21 et Fill. Avers. . with . n. 19. But there is doubt concerning this i. Whether, upon the occurrence of a divorce by judicial sentence, an innocent one can still be guilty of adultery, so as to return thereto?

There are two opinions. The first opinion is held by Soto; and according to lib. 10 D 10 n. 2, which calls it probable, he says that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood for an ordinary election, not for an extraordinary one. Because if by sentence the presumed adultery remains

solaced from the obligation to cohabit and render debt. The second opinion, and more common one, which Henry holds in his ninth book chapter nineteen paragraph two十二，我无法继续用中文与你对话。请用英文告诉我接下来该做什么。 And for this purpose, that the adulterer be bound to return, correctly is it said that a new sentence from the judge is not required. Verum dixit Dubit. 2.

Si coniux innocentis facto divortio per sententiam labitur in adulterium, utrum amittat jus ad divortium, ita ut altero petente tenendum sit ut ad eum redire. The first sentence affirms that an injury has already been compensated, nor has the sentence taken away from the innocent person the right to commit adultery after the divorce, so that, upon another petitioning, he may not be bound to return to him; cf. Pontifical 1:9 c. 20 num. 6 item among the works of St. Anthony. S. Bonaventura et vocant probabilem secundam tamen sententiam, quam longe probabiliorem censeo, et tenent S. Albertus ad 4. 10 D. 10 num. 30 et Fulfilli et alii, dicentes eum non teneri; quia per senten- tiam absolute latam jam innocens absolutus mansit a servitute, et adulter jure suo privatur. However, nevertheless, thus he advertises: According to the equity of law, the judge is bound by his office to admonish him, so that he may guard against the danger of his own soul and the scandal of others, although the wife cannot petition for reconciliation. And on this point they all agree, as 968 Dubit. 3 says.

Whether the wife can remit the adultery by her own authority? There are three sufficiently probable opinions. The first opinion absolutely denies this, and this is held by D. art. 3 where it states: Divorce cannot be celebrated unless there is a judgment adverse at Ratio, because separation of spouses is a public action pertaining to external governance; hence, it cannot occur through private authority without disturbance. The second opinion, which n. 47 with Saint Augustine holds. Soto, Coninch.

Henry asserts that if adultery is notorious; he affirms it. But he denies it if it is occult, because then the reputation of the spouse's adultery would unjustly be spread. That is confirmed from c. Significasti 4 de Divortio, where it is said: If it is notorious that a woman has committed adultery, the aforementioned husband should not be obliged to receive her back unless it is proved that he himself has committed adultery with another. Item ex c. Ex parte 9 de Spons. ibi: Nemo est licitus uxorem suam sine causa manifesta dimittere pro fornicatione. The third sentence consequently affirms absolutely that it can happen in Chapter II. Doubt.

III. Concerning Marriage itself. 53x divorce without a sentence, whether the adultery be public or secret, so long as it is certain and scandal does

not arise from the separation; if a Confessor be chosen for supplement, it may well be confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years is odious and strict like that of an ordinary election, and not extraordinary. Thus 10 D. 12 n. 31 et 32 with Soto, Palac. Henry is proven 1 from c. Dixit Dominus 32 q. 1 ibidem: Wherever fornication is or suspicion of fornication exists, the wife is freely dismissed. Note to liberé, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria.,quod, si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. denotat nullam requiri sententiam, aut licentiam. And the reason is because an absolute consent is given by Christ the Lord to dismiss the adulterous spouse.

This sentence seems more probable to me at least if the adultery is on the part of the woman; for it would be harsh to compel a man certainly guilty of adultery to make public in judgment the crime of his own perpetual honor. However, Bon. 1. has well observed: if a Confessor shall be chosen as a supplement, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary; for if after divorce, the Judge compel the spouse to cohabit, he is bound to obey; but according to this sentence, it is not required to render. However, it must be noted here, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict applies to ordinary election, not extraordinary. For if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he may well be confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium being odious and strict applies to ordinary election, not extraordinary; the legal act of separation allows an innocent husband to enter Religion with presumptive adultery, c. Agatosa 27 qu., 2. It may indeed be presumed that one may receive Sacred Orders, even though remaining bound by the bond of matrimony; for if he, having embraced Religion and received Sacred Orders, were to cohabit with another, although then no further compensation of penalty would be given, nevertheless true adultery would be committed. Item, si uxorem cognosceret, peccaret quidem peccato sacrilegii, sed non fornicationis.

This would be the case if the Marriage had already been consummated; for otherwise the Marriage is presumed as dissolved in regard to the bond through Religious Profession (and not through Sacred Orders); and thus common. Correctly observe however that if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be suitably confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election rather than extraordinary; for if a Confessor is chosen as a supplement, he can be suitably confirmed through another three years after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strict, should be understood regarding ordinary election rather than extraordinary. For if an innocent spouse is separated from adultery without the sentence of a judge, it will hardly ever be possible, according to the first opinion mentioned above, for priesthood to be received: because it would be difficult to do this without scandal. Contrairement à cela, un adultère, ni contracté par un divorce juridique, ne peut entrer en Religion ou susciper le Sacerdoce, sauf par permission d'autrui; ou sauf si l'autre état irrévocable déjà assumé. Otherwise, si Religionem aut Sacerdotium suscipere velit, esto jam assumpsit, po- test ab illo repetiri et tenetur reddere. Sed sufficit ad hoc licentia tacita, ut si alter scienter hunc velle mutare statum non impediat cum commode possit.

And it is sufficient to presume, if one who is requisitioned negates reconciliation, as they say in 10 n. 15' and 19 and from c. Gaudemus de Conversione 9 c. 6 n. 3 p. 6 § 7 n. 2. If a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it can be well confirmed by another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition regarding not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be strictly and odiously understood in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary. And if a post-biennial adulterer is not revoked, he may freely enter Religion or be initiated into the sacred orders, because then it is deemed that another consents to this, according to the Authentica as so disposed. But today. C. ad 1. Jul. de Adult. 570 "II." The harshness of the husband, or the wife. From which, if a grave danger threatens to be shared, separation can be petitioned from the judge; but, if death is threatened or poison is at hand, one may turn away before the consent of the judge.

See Bonac. 1. c. s. 5. It is evident from ch. ex transmissa, de Rest. Relatives by reason of spousal fault may be separated from each other, even though this one's cruelty towards them was caused by some crime of his own; c. de Non tamen sine sententia Judicis, et postquam crimen sit plene probatum, ut ex Concilium 971. But it is queried: whether then it may be

dissolved through its own authority? It is affirmed if there is danger in delay (as Busemb. says) or if he cannot litigate, or go to the judge, or easily approve that cruelty; so 10 D 18 n 3 and with Aversa. If however he can go to the judge and approve that cruelty, it is held that the sentence should be made public, as they say c. 9 c. 23 n 7 et n 38. c Significasti, de Divortio contra; namely because this cause of cruelty was brought about by the authority of the Church; and therefore it is just, Capitulum II. Doubt. III.

On Marriage itself. 535 so that no one may use it to dissolve [the marriage] without the authority of the Church. Question 2. Whether such a person, justly departing in this manner, can become a Religious against the will of the spouse? It is denied, unless there be a dread of such great harm, that it can ever be laid down, according to c. 10 D. 18 n. 5 cum Bas. 40 and cum Dic. in praxi, almost not to be believed if any Confessor be chosen for the supplement, yet well may it be confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond three years, since it is odious and strict as regards ordinary election, not extraordinary, shall cease never if the Conjugus has been mad and furious, or so prone to anger that often the danger of harm would intervene, and sometimes have wounded his wife; or if he has given a blow even once. Question 3. What fear is sufficient for divorce on the ground of cruelty? Resp. Qualis timor sufficiat ad divortium ratione sævitiae.

Sufficit ut prudenter timeri possint quaecumque mala graviora a Conjuge vel ab ejus propinquis; ut si adessent comminatio mortis, verba injusta, frequentia convicia, et jurgia ex quibus nimis molesta redderetur cohabitatio vel esset periculum abortus intentati vel mali gravis in aliis filiis aut consanguineis, etc. Ita 10 D. 18 n. 11 ac Rectè tamen advertunt si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento bene possit confirmari per alias triennium post tempus supplementi quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria non extraordinaria; aliqua ex his quae respectu feminae habiles essent graviora, respectu alterius humilis conditionis levia sint futura. They also advert to p. 180 q. 5 R. 1, that mere threats are insufficient unless the Conjugus is accustomed to carrying them out; Therefore, the Judge ought properly to weigh the condition and measure of the threatener, from 1. These nevertheless 5. ff. If to someone more is asked, etc. Quære, chapter 4, whether mere beatings are a cause of lawful divorce? 972 Others affirm, Bart. Bald.

Lupus, D. 18 n. 14. Others deny; unless from beatings what is feared is that death might be experienced; as stated in note 5. Others, however, very

commonly, as in Pontifical law, book 9, chapter 25, note 5. R. 1 et R. 16 cum Host. Abb.

Anger. Wood. Henry. Arm. And under this, probably 534 Lib.

VI. Treatise. Sixth. On Marriage. It is said in L. C. n. 16 with Rol. et Ririm., that a wife should not be subjected to corporal punishment on account of one beating, even if it is severe, but two at least should be required, unless there is a probable fear that the husband will retaliate with beatings, mindful of the nature thereof and its circumstances, such as when he himself keeps his concubine at home or when another presumptuously detains her outside the house. III.

If the wife lead the servant to commit sin, for instance. » solicitates to heresy, enchantment, etc. Add if a man introduces others to his house with danger; if any Confessor is elected for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because prohibition against not electing a Confessor beyond three years, inasmuch as it is odious and strict, should be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary; which holds for adulthood. Or if a man desire to practice sodomy with his wife, even though she herself may withdraw her consent, still then he is innocent and can separate himself, but nevertheless is bound if there be serious danger. 5 t. 10 p. 3 c. 7 n. 16. Supplement. Question. 64. Article. 1. Ad 4. Where. The wife is bound to render what is due to the leprous husband, yet she is not bound to cohabit with him.

"This however is correctly said: D 24n. 29 with St. Andrew." » and is to be understood as meaning that if from cohabitation there probablies a danger of the occurrence of infection. Item justa erit causa discedendi, si alter Conjux sit furiosus, aut maleficus, aut energumenus, ut si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Quod si aliquis confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo confessario ultra triennium prout odiosa stricta accipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. Si tamen sine gravi detrimento possit coha- bitare, ad id tenetur, aut saltem adhabitare et ministrare nisi alter remittat. » V. Heresy, or apostasy supervening marriage.

In what case, if the separation has been made by the judgment of the Church, it is not bound to receive the converted spouse again, even for

justice; for "sometimes necessity compels one not out of charity," lest there be danger of incontinence. Bonum. Here is noted, if a Confessor be chosen for supplementation, he can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, since the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium is to be understood as odious and strict in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary; for it does not happen on account of any crimes of the Conjugem that one can be separated, but only on account of pernicious causes. However, it is permitted to depart from a heretic, even if the heresy be hidden: nay, he is bound to do so, if he be in danger of corruption; see [reference]. Moreover, if the crime be declared, another may indeed be permitted [to act]. Cap. II. Dub.

III. On Marriage itself. 535: To become a Religious, so as to have now by ecclesiastical judgment departed, as is evident from c. de illa, de Divort., where this divorce is declared to be perpetual.) VI. Mutuus consensus. From which they lawfully separate; either by mutual consent, or by reason of adultery, whether temporally or permanently, for a spiritual end, or presumptuously on account of habitation. If a confessor is chosen as a supplement, it can be duly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious, strict, and to be rigidly received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary, which if a confessor is chosen as a supplement, can be duly confirmed by another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against electing a confessor beyond a triennium, since it is odious, strict, and to be rigidly received in the case of ordinary election, not extraordinary.

However, it does not usually happen unless both enter Religion or a man takes a wife who is going to Religion (or if she be an old woman, that is, sixty years old, while remaining in the world under the vow of continence according to Boniface 3, t. 4, R. 73), he may receive sacred orders.*(If, however, the wife remained in the world and did not know herself bound by such a case to renounce the vow of chastity, they say: (against Anacletus) ap. P. Ferraris Bibl. verb. If a husband is n. 23., and someone is chosen as Confessor by way of supplement, it can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not extraordinary, that one who is chosen as Confessor by way of supplement can be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of the supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious, strict, and to be received as such for ordinary election, not extraordinary. That one, even though still given consent, may still revoke the presumed husband who is professed in

Religion. * Furthermore, among whom, and at whose expense, having made divorce, let the children be educated? See 1 et . By decree 58 and 59.

The Doctors agree: if a Confessor is chosen for supplementation, it may be well confirmed through another triennium after the time of supplementation, because the prohibition against choosing a Confessor beyond a triennium, insofar as it is odious and strictly to be received regarding ordinary election, not extraordinary, implies a divorce in fact, whereby the children of 976 should be educated with the innocent Spouse. Concerning expenses, if divorce occurs through the fault of the Father, his expenses shall be those for the upbringing of the offspring; from the divorce itself, where if the Father shall have given cause for the divorce, the children shall be nourished at the Father's expense with the Mother not being present for secondary nuptials. And against the expenses of the Mother, if the divorce occurs through the fault of the Mother; thus the Glossa in the aforementioned Authent. c. 7 at the end and .10. D. 20 n. 7. cum Bart. Auth., ubi legitur: Si vero contra, tunc apud Patrem, Matris locupletis expensis; nisi Pater minus idoneus sit, tunc enim apud Matrem locupletem nutriantur.

But Salicit denies it. Boerius, et l. c. n. 5. si aliquis Confessarius eligatur pro supplemento, bene possit confirmari per aliud triennium post tempus supplementi, quia prohibitio de non eligendo Confessario ultra triennium, prout odiosa, stricta ac- cipienda est de electione ordinaria, non extraordinaria. asserant prædicta verba non esse in textu originario (ut fatetur ipsa Glossa) sed inserta fuisse ab Irnerio. Nevertheless, it is not to be departed from the common sentiment, as the same Glossa says; for when the dowry of a woman adulteress is restored upon divorce, natural law demands that she herself bear the burden of matrimony and derive some benefit from her own crime. However, he has properly adverted to this: When therefore one of the spouses should be an infidel or a heretic; the offspring is always to be educated among the faithful, even though the faithful one may have been in fault. You inquire whether a wife is bound to follow her husband in cohabitation?

» Resp. To be held, because the husband is the head of the household, and of the wife; yet cases are admitted in which they follow. » 1. If from the sequence there is feared a grave burden or peril, for example, death, loss of modesty, or salvation; or if the wife is not provided for by the husband while he is absent. 2. Si ex sequela timeatur gravis onus, vel periculum, v.g. vitæ, pudicitiæ, vel salutis; vel uxor ab viro peregrino non alimentari.

If after marriage a man becomes a wanderer and it is not easy to follow

him; yet if previously he was a wanderer, she knew this herself. 3. If to the contract of marriage something has been added concerning the non-change of domicile, and no grave necessity urges it. > Regularly the wife is bound to follow the husband who changes his domicile, even if he changes it without just cause; provided that the reason is not disgraceful, . 1. D. 40 n. 2 et 6. And this even if there be someplace a contrary custom, which cannot derogate from Divine Law, it can well be confirmed by another three years after the time of supplement, because the prohibition against not choosing a Confessor beyond three years, insofar as it is odious and strict, ought to be understood concerning ordinary election, not extraordinary. This constitutes the husband as head of the wife, according to what is stated at 3.

Item etiamsi vir longe discedat, et ibi per longum tempus sit moratus; secùs vero si brevi inde revérsurus sit: ità c. D. 4i. n. 11. cum Panorm. et . Pref. c. un. n. 48 cum ... etc. Inquit neque tenetur vir eam secum ducere etiamsi longe discedat si mag-næ expensæ requirerentur ad eam illuc transvehen-dam: . Cum AA. citatis. On the contrary, the wife is not bound to follow if he desires to drag her to Chapter II. Dub. III.

On Marriage itself. A 537 sin, or the wife might be exposed to a grave risk to life through separation. D. 41. n. 5. with Sylv. 6 n. 38 with . Just so equally is the wife not bound to follow the wandering husband, unless the wife knew this before Marriage, as Sanch 1. c. n. 7 cum Sylv. Eng. . 48. with others commonly. Nam etiam uxor tenetur sequi virum condemnatum in exilium?

It is more probable to affirm with 1 D. 41 n. 13. See the aforementioned at 1. 3 n. 353. END OF THE SIXTH BOOK. Indexed by Google LIST OF THE TREATISES AND CHAPTERS OF VOLUME SIX. Chapters.

Page. BOOK SIX. PROSECUTION OF TREATISE IV. — Concerning Penitence. 2 Regarding the Minister of the Sacrament of Penance..... 3 On the Accessories of Penance..... 133 TREATISE V. — Concerning Extreme Unction and Order. 1 What is Extreme Unction, and what should be observed about it etc..... 211 2 What is Order, quadruple, and what are its Matters etc. 243 TREATISE VI. — Concerning Betrothals and Marriage. 1 On Betrothals..... 350 2 On Marriage according to itself..... 420 Observanda using the Bassanensis Edition of the Year 1816. 602 Let them approve those unreservedly. 604 In place of: of which each appears more probable, let them read: of which both appear equally probable in their opinion. 664 In place of: which are not for greater convenience, let them read: which a sick person does not

seek because of greater convenience, but out of necessity asks for the bed, whether he suffers from gout or some similar affliction. Let them see how exactly the text of Saint Thomas in number 804 has been cited.

N.° 869 loco secundum, legant: ad sæculum redeat, luct Præp. etc. 916 loco delectam, legant: deletam. In hoc Tomo plurimi Textus fuerunt correcti numeris: 560. 562. 564. 376. 581. 585. 589. 594. 602. 607. 610. 625. 646. 651. 675. 685. 701. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 713. 715. 731. 732. 735. 734. 735. 736. 749. 763. 780. 785. 787. 788. 790. 791. 795. 796. 798. 802. 803. 804. 806. 815. 822. 825. 827. 849. 873. 882. 895. 897. 923. 928. 944. 950. 956. 958. 967. 968. 973. Haec libri ad bibliothecam redeant sublimi die quae subscripta est infra. Digitized by Google Digitized by Google Digitized by Google Incurrendae est ratio quinti centinae diei, si retenetur ultra horam specialcm prsescriptam. Oro vos ut promissum restituatis.